F
835
S415
1908

TRUE SUCCESSION
IN
CHURCH PRESIDENCY

BANCROFT
LIBRARY

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/truesuccessionin00smitrich

TRUE SUCCESSION

IN

CHURCH PRESIDENCY

OF THE

CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS.

BEING A REPLY TO ELDER B. H. ROBERTS ON
"SUCCESSION IN THE PRESIDENCY OF THE CHURCH."

BY Conoman
ELDER HEMAN C. SMITH,
Church Historian.

"While I have powers of body and mind; while water runs and grass grows; while virtue is lovely, and vice hateful; and while a stone points out a sacred spot where a fragment of American liberty once was; I or my posterity will plead the cause of injured innocence, . . ."—Joseph Smith, *Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, p, 395.

THIRD EDITION.

LAMONI, IOWA:
PUBLISHED BY THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE
REORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER DAY SAINTS.
1908.

F835
S415
1908

Copyrighted by the BOARD OF PUBLICATION of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Publishers and Proprietors, in the year 1898, in the office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE,
LAMONI, IOWA.

59213
BANCROFT
LIBRARY

PREFACE.

THE only apology needed for the appearance of this work is, that we have been attacked, and it is both a privilege and a duty to respond. Some have thought the church was too slow and should have replied long ago. But had we rushed into print when the work of Mr. Roberts first appeared, we would have done so unadvisedly. We did not know whether he was authorized to write or not; nor did we know whether the church he represented would indorse his positions; hence no one was appointed to reply; though it was not lost sight of, and several of the elders upon their own responsibility were carefully collecting material for use in such reply. Now that the representatives of the church in Utah, both in Europe and America, have made it their chief weapon of attack and defense, we think the opportune time has come, for they are thus pledged to its support. Further, we have the direct testimony of Mr. Roberts that the First Presidency in Utah indorsed his work. The book was copyrighted in February, 1894.

In the latter part of the year 1895 Mr. Roberts, together with Moses Thatcher, fell under the displeasure of church authorities for his political actions; while under the ban of disapproval he was interviewed, and the interview published in the Salt Lake *Tribune* for October 14, 1895. The following is an extract from the interview:—

STATEMENT BY ROBERTS.

CLAIMS THAT HE CONFRONTS A GRAVE CRISIS.

The following authorized statement by B. H. Roberts, in the form of an interview, was given out at the Democratic State headquarters last evening.

Being asked for his views upon the present political situation, Mr. Roberts said:—

PREFACE.

"I have always regarded myself as properly respectful and attentive to church authority. In my labors in the church, whether in missionary or literary affairs. I have always consulted with the presidency when communication was possible; and their wishes have been respectfully followed. All the manuscripts of tracts and books of which I am the author, that have been written in advocacy or defense of the Mormon faith have been invariably submitted to their personal inspection or to the inspection of committees appointed by them."

This, then, fixes the responsibility of an indorsement upon the Presidency; and in meeting the issues discussed by Mr. Roberts in "Succession in the Presidency of the Church," we are not simply meeting Mr. Roberts alone, but we are meeting the authorized positions of the church in Utah upon the issues involved.

In addition to this Mr. Roberts is one of the seven Presidents of Seventy, a leading minister, a popular lecturer, and an author of no mean repute among his fellows, being the author of the "Life of John Taylor," "Outlines of Ecclesiastical History," "The Gospel," and other publications.

Having then located our contestants and estimated the strength of their position, we advance to the examination confident of the final triumph of the right wherever found; and send forth this little book with a humble prayer that the erring may learn wisdom and the darkened mind receive light. We wish here to gratefully acknowledge the assistance rendered us by valuable suggestions given us by several.

With much confidence we submit the issues involved to the careful investigation of an indulgent, but discerning public.

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER 1.

Basic Prediction — Rigdon Slandered — Exonerated — A Fraud—Meeting of August 8—Woodruff Against the Record—Resolution of August 8..... 5

CHAPTER 2.

William Smith—Slandered by Roberts—Suspended From Office — Restored — Sustained — Ordained a Patriarch—Highly Commended — Roberts Errs Concerning Him—Preaches Lineal Priesthood—Brighamites Expel Him—Lucy Smith et al. Considered..... 15

CHAPTER 3.

Wight and Miller—Wight's Character—Roberts' Blunder—Wight Goes to Wisconsin—His Record—His Followers—Galveston News' Tribute—Miller—His Reason for Leaving Former Associations—Hewett's Letter..... 21

CHAPTER 4.

Strang—Challenges Taylor and Hyde—Their Reply—Roberts' Unmanly Attack..... 26

CHAPTER 5.

History of Reorganization—Briggs' Priesthood—Twelve at Nauvoo—Roberts' Sarcasm—Piercy on Smith Family—President Smith's Pledge—Roberts' Philosophy..... 28

CHAPTER 6.

Wight's Testimony—Goes to Wisconsin—Roberts' Theory False—Smith and Wight Teach Lineal Priesthood—Strangite Resolution—"Young Joseph's" Blessings—His Statement — Revelation of 1841 — Joseph's Blessing—Whitehead's Testimony—Testimony of Emma Smith—G. J. Adams on Lineage — Carter's Testimony — Witnesses Not Impeached—Bishop Miller—Hyrum Smith's Ordination—Law of Lineage—Joseph Smith on Descent—Calhoun Letter — Call by Revelation — Reorganization Approved — Richards' Correspondence — Ordination of President Smith—Rights of Appointment..... 36

CHAPTER 7.

Roberts' Discrepancies — Twelve Second in Authority—Temple not Completed—Church Rejected—Pratt's Revelation..... 67

CHAPTER 8.

Keys of Authority—Keys and Oracles—Pratt's Revelation—Oracles to the Twelve—William Marks—Roberts' Climax. 76

CHAPTER 9.

The Twelve—Necessity for a Reorganization—Church Held Together—Building of Nauvoo, etc.—Driven to Rocky Mountains — Joseph's Prophecy — Pratt's Statement—Isaiah's Prophecy — The Exodus — Seventies — Baptism For the Dead—Temple Building—Persecution..... 85

CHAPTER 10.

Penrose—Leading Spirits—Woodruff's Testimony—Discipline—Spencer Interview..... 101

CHAPTER 11.

Brigham Young — His Career — Whereabouts of Authorities—Authorities not in Harmony—Twelve Sustained—Seasonable Notice Promised—Growth of Presiding Idea—Rebaptism—Reordination — Reorganization — Promise of Seasonable Notice Violated — Changes Made — Written Word Discarded — Adam-God — Vulgar Teaching — Concerning Debts—Expert Scoundrels—Blood Atonement—Polygamy..... 114

CHAPTER 12.

Points Established — Relevant Question — Acknowledged People of God—Authority to Choose and Ordain—Teaching of Joseph Smith's Successor—Conclusion..... 132

CHAPTER 13.

Correspondence—Letters of Long—of Deseret News—of C. W. Penrose—of Clark—of Richards—Position of Richards and Penrose — of Reorganization — Presidency — Apostleship—Presidency of High Priesthood—Josephite Contention Sustained—Penrose Dilemma—Conclusion... 149

True Succession in Church Presidency.

CHAPTER 1.

BASIC PREDICTION — RIGDON SLANDERED — EXONERATED — A FRAUD — MEETING OF AUGUST 8.—WOODRUFF AGAINST THE RECORD—RESOLUTION OF AUGUST 8—RIGDON ACQUIESCES.

MR. ROBERTS introduces his treatise by quoting what purports to be language of Brigham Young used on August 8, 1844, as follows:—

All that want to draw away a party from the Church after them, let them do it if they can, but they will not prosper.

He assumes that this language is prophetic, then proceeds to show its fulfillment by citing the failure of the movements under Rigdon, William Smith, J. J. Strang, and others. In each of these cases he repeats this purported prediction as a climax to his argument. As Mr. Roberts has given this purported statement so much prominence, we will give it a brief consideration.

First, there is nothing peculiarly significant in the statement. It is but a sentiment which any person who had accepted the latter-day work would feel safe in expressing, and one which was generally held and doubtless frequently expressed at the time, and one which would have received the unqualified indorsement of Rigdon, Strang, and every other claimant to the Presidency of the church; a sentiment too which we most heartily agree to, for we most assuredly believe that no man or men will prosper in leading away a party from the church. But the questions were *then* and are *now*, Where was or is the church?. Who represented or represents it? Instead of meeting these questions squarely and fairly, Mr. Roberts assumes the very point at issue by supposing that the

party led by Brigham Young and his colleagues was and is the accepted church. This is illogical, and contrary to all rules of evidence, subjecting its author to an unenviable position as a controversialist.

In the second place, if we concede that the statement referred to was a prophetic one, the evidence of its correctness is not complete so long as there are two flourishing organizations contending for recognition; and Mr. Roberts admits that he cannot point to a fulfillment of his pet prediction as applied to the Reorganization. He says:—

> Now that we draw to the close of our consideration of the claims of this "Reorganized church," we cannot point to its destruction as we have done in the case of Sidney Rigdon's church, William Smith's church, and James J. Strang's church; for the Reorganized church still exists. But its doom is written as distinctly as that of the other false churches that we have seen crumble to pieces into shapeless heaps of ruin. It is only a question of time with regard to its failure. MENE, MENE, TEKEL, is written upon its walls—God hath numbered thy kingdom—weighed in the balances—found wanting!—Succession, by Roberts, page 99.

Mr. Roberts forms his conclusion in advance of the evidence to support it, and then utters a prediction of his own upon the fulfillment of which depends the correctness of his basic prediction, a very unfortunate and unsafe thing to do. Were we, like he, to beg the question by assuming, in advance of the evidence, that the Reorganization is accepted of God, we could cite in confirmation the failure of Rigdon, Smith, and Strang, with as much consistency as does he. We could also bolster up our conclusion by predicting the downfall of the church in Utah with just as much flourish and with at least as much prospect of success. We hope, however, that if driven to such straits we will have the honesty to withdraw from the controversy.

If this purported statement of Brigham Young's is a

true prediction, who can now tell whether it will be fulfilled in the destruction and dismemberment of the organization of the church in Utah or that of the Reorganization?

In the third place, the evidence that Brigham Young made this statement at the time and place claimed, is not very clear. Mr. Roberts quotes it from the *Millennial Star*, volume 25, page 216, a publication issued about 1863, nearly twenty years after the event. The account of the meeting published soon afterward, in *Times and Seasons* for September 2, 1844, does not contain these words or anything of like purport. Had such a sentiment been expressed and understood to have been prophetic in its character, it is but reasonable to suppose that some notice of it would have been included in the published account. (See *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, pp. 637, 638.)

So much then for this so-called prediction which is brought forward with so great a flourish of trumpets to form the basic thought of Mr. Roberts' great effort. Summarized, it amounts to this: (a) The statement if made is irrelevent and of no force. (b) It lacks evidence of complete fulfillment. (c) The evidence that such a statement was made is very questionable. If Mr. Roberts has not endeavored to make a mountain out of a molehill, who ever did? It was the custom then for these several factions to prophesy against each other, and if there was either evidence or argument in it, we could quote more remarkable predictions from Rigdon and others against the Brighamites. We have no inclination to defend either the claims or the acts of Rigdon and some others referred to by Mr. Roberts; but in the interest of common justice, and in behalf of historic truth, we feel called upon to notice some of Mr. Roberts' blunders and misrepresentations.

For the most of Mr. Roberts' assertions regarding Mr. Rigdon and what Joseph the Prophet said of him, he cites no authority, and for the remainder cites hearsay, or pub-

lications issued many years afterward. He quotes largely from the "History of Joseph Smith" as contained in the *Millennial Star*, volume 25. How came these events, transpiring *after* the death of Joseph Smith, to be made a part of his history? Who wrote them as such, and by what authority?

One of the most unkind things said of Mr. Rigdon by Mr. Roberts is the following:—

> Moreover, it was known that he was in sympathy and even in communication with some of the avowed enemies of Joseph, among others with that arch traitor, John C. Bennett, who was plotting the overthrow of both Joseph and the church.—Roberts, page 2.

That Mr. Rigdon was suspected of this is true, but that he was *known* to be guilty, is very doubtful. On the contrary, he was exonerated. The supposed correspondence and conspiracy between him and Governor Carlin, John C. Bennett, and others, was fully investigated at the October conference of 1843; and at the conclusion of the examination, as the published minutes of the conference have it:—

> President Joseph Smith arose and satisfactorily explained to the congregation the supposed treacherous correspondence with Ex-Governor Carlin, which wholly removed suspicion from Elder Sidney Rigdon, and from every other person.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 4, p. 330.

That Mr. Rigdon's conduct in some respects was blamable, we do not doubt; but how could Mr. Roberts assert that it was *known* that he was guilty of an offense of which the record says that suspicion was wholly removed from him to the satisfaction of the assembled church? Yet Mr. Roberts in his "Preface" explains the incentive that has prompted him in this work as follows:—

> My desire to preserve from error those not acquainted with the order of the priesthood of God, and the facts of church history in the great dispensation of the last days, has been the incentive which prompted me to write it.

To misrepresent the facts of history is not the proper

way to preserve from error those who are ignorant on the subject; and to falsely heap odium upon a man who is not here to defend himself, no matter what his failings may have been, is detestable. But it has been the policy of Brigham Young and his fellows, since 1844, to vilify, slander, and abuse every one who refused to indorse their measures. These tendencies to misrepresent the facts of history and to heap opprobrium upon opponents are painfully apparent in the work of Mr. Roberts now under consideration. We may have occasion to frequently invite attention to these tendencies, though we should not do so only in the interest of truth and justice.

After other reflections upon the character of Mr. Rigdon, Mr. Roberts introduces the meeting of August 8, 1844, which was called by Mr. Rigdon, but which, according to the record, was largely under the dictation of some members of the Quorum of Twelve with Brigham Young at their head. To the events of this meeting we wish to pay some attention, for it is important to know just what the church did in that critical emergency.

One peculiar feature of the meeting as reported by eyewitnesses needs close attention from the fact that Mr. Roberts and others have relied upon it as strong evidence that God had chosen Brigham Young to lead the people. It is asserted that on that occasion Brigham Young spoke with the voice of Joseph Smith and in personal appearance looked like him, which convinced the people that the mantle of Joseph had fallen upon him. Upon this point Mr. Roberts introduces three witnesses, as follows:—

George Q. Cannon, who was present on that occasion, says:—
If Joseph had risen from the dead and again spoken in their hearing, the effect could not have been more startling than it was to many present at that meeting; it was the voice of Joseph himself; and not only was it the voice of Joseph which was heard, but it seemed in the eyes of the people as if it were

the very person of Joseph which stood before them. A more wonderful and miraculous event than was wrought that day in the presence of that congregation we never heard of.

In the journal of Elder Wm. C. Staines, of that date, the following statement is recorded:

Brigham Young said—"I will tell you who your leaders or guardians will be. The Twelve—I at their head!' This was with a voice like the voice of the prophet Joseph. I thought it was he, and so did thousands who heard it. This was very satisfactory to the people, and a vote was taken to sustain the Twelve in their office, which, with a few dissenting voices, was passed."

President Wilford Woodruff, describing the event, says:

When Brigham Young arose and commenced speaking, as has been said, if I had not seen him with my own eyes, there is no one that could have convinced me that it was not Joseph Smith; and anyone can testify to this who was acquainted with these two men.—Roberts, pp. 5–7.

Upon this but little comment is needed. If the testimony of the witnesses be true, it furnishes no evidence that God had chosen Brigham Young. In the history of God's dealings with men there is not found evidence that he causes one to change his individuality for that of another, or to imitate another so as to deceive his people into the belief that it is the one imitated. By the influence of his Spirit he enables men to develop and more fully equips them for usefulness in his service, but never causes them to deceive the people by appearing to be what they are not. Only hypocrites are guilty of this species of fraud. To make God the author of it is to make him a party to a hypocritical transaction of which no honest man would be guilty. Had God chosen Brigham Young he would have presented Brigham Young before the people clothed with authority and power to lead his people, but he would not have fraudulently passed him off as Joseph Smith. That instance if true would brand the movement as a deceptive one.

This kind of a trick was tried as early as the days of Moses. In a revelation given through Joseph Smith, in

June, 1830, and now published in the Inspired Translation of the Scriptures, it is recorded:—

> And now, when Moses had said these words, Satan cried with a loud voice, and went upon the earth, and commanded, saying, I am the Only Begotten, worship me.—Par. 12.

Paul gives us some light upon this sort of work. He says:—

> For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.—2 Cor. 11:13–15.

If the reader will carefully examine the above passages he will not be at a loss to determine by what power it is probable that Brigham Young could so transform himself that "it seemed in the eyes of the people as if it were the very person of Joseph which stood before them;" especially so when nothing of this nature can be found in the dealings of God. Mr. Young himself may have been deceived, but whether he was ignorant or conscious of the part he was playing, we cannot be ignorant in regard to the authorship of this deceptive transformation policy.

The counterpart of this transaction can be found in modern spiritualism, where a medium or a spirit assumes a familiar form and voice. This clew may enable us to account for some of the dark and mysterious things connected with the people who accepted, as from God, the peculiar phenomenon exhibited at Nauvoo on August 8, 1844. It was an opportune time for the spirit of darkness to step in, and was improved to the sorrow and disappointment of many. Oh, that he who had the influence to lead had possessed the discernment and strength of Moses to have said, "Depart hence, Satan!"

Just what did transpire at that important meeting it is very hard to determine, for the accounts are quite conflict-

ing. It is quite clear that the meeting was called by Elder Sidney Rigdon for the purpose of presenting his claims, but it appears that Brigham Young took the active oversight of it, if he did not entirely monopolize it. By the account published at the time it does not appear that Elder Rigdon was permitted to address the meeting. Brigham Young "called the audience to order" and "arranged the several quorums." Prayer was offered by Elder Phelps. Elder Young then spoke, followed by Elders Lyman, Phelps, and Pratt; then Elder Young closed and during his remarks presented certain motions. Elder Rigdon is not mentioned as a participant except in his refusal to have his name presented to the assembly when the voting was had. See *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, pp. 637, 638. Yet Mr. Roberts states:—

> The next day was the one appointed by Sidney Rigdon for the church to assemble and choose a "Guardian." The attendance was large, as intense interest had been awakened upon the subject to be considered. Sidney Rigdon addressed the assembly, setting forth his claim to the "Guardianship" of the church. He had full opportunity to present his case, and for an hour and a half spoke without interruption; but despite his reputation as an orator, he failed to convince the saints that he was sent of God.—Roberts, p. 5.

After this discussion the published account states: "Counsellor Rigdon refused to have his name voted for as a spokesman or guardian." In harmony with this Mr. Roberts explains in a footnote on page 10, as follows:—

> The quorums had been arranged to vote separately and in their order, but when Elder Young put the question on accepting the Twelve to preside over the church, the question was put to all the quorums and the whole congregation at once. And since the vote to sustain the Twelve was unanimous, there was no need of putting the question on the acceptance of Sidney Rigdon either to the quorums or the people.—The facts in the text are quoted from the history of the prophet Joseph, *Mill. Star*, Vol. XXV., p. 264.

Yet Mr. Roberts makes President Woodruff to contradict this by quoting him as follows:—

Nearly all the quorum of the Twelve were on missions in the eastern States when the terrible tragedy at Carthage took place; and we did not hear of it for some time afterwards. We returned to Nauvoo. It has been repeated to you here tonight what was done in the conference in Nauvoo. I do not know whether there is anyone present here tonight but myself who was at that conference—there are but few living who were present on that occasion. Brigham stepped forth as a leader of Israel, as has been said here tonight by Brother Roberts, and Sidney Rigdon also tried to get the presidency; but when his name was put to a vote before the conference of the Latter-day Saints, and they were asked if they wanted him as their guardian, to guide them in the Celestial Kingdom, Brigham said: "All who do, raise your right hand," and I did not see a hand raised in his favor in that congregation.—Roberts, p. 119.

Now let us inquire what did that assembly vote for? It is important to know. The record as published in *Times and Seasons* gives it as follows: " 'All in favor of supporting the Twelve in their calling, (every quorum, man and woman,) signify it by the uplifted hand;' and the vote was unanimous, no hand being raised in the negative." No wonder it was unanimous. No Latter Day Saint would refuse to support them in their calling. Very likely Elder Rigdon voted for that. In doing so no one was committed to the subsequent policy of the Twelve. But Mr. Roberts, on the authority of the *Millennial Star* published nearly twenty years later, gives the resolution as follows:—

"Do the Church want and is it their only desire to sustain the Twelve as the First Presidency of this people? . . . . . If the Church want the Twelve to stand as the head, the First Presidency of the Church, and at the head of this kingdom in all the world, stand next to Joseph, walk up into their calling, and hold the keys of this kingdom—every man, every woman, every quorum is now put in order, and you are now the sole controllers of it—all that are in favor of this in all the congregation of the Saints, manifest it by holding up the right hand. (There was a universal vote.) If there are any of the contrary mind—every man and every woman who does not want the Twelve to preside, lift up your hands in like manner.

(No hands up.) This supersedes the other question, and trying it by quorums.—Roberts, pages 9, 10.

The reader I think will concede that the account published at the time is the more likely to be correct, and hence the church was not at that time committed to sustaining the Twelve as a First Presidency. If then Mr. Rigdon did as Mr. Roberts states he did in the following quotation, the reason is quite clear:—

It may be interesting to the reader to know that Sidney Rigdon himself outwardly seemed to acquiesce in the decision of the church with regard to himself. The Sunday following the meeting above described he addressed the saints for a long time, "blessed them in the name of the Lord; telling them emphatically that he was with the Twelve. He wished to know the mind of the church in relation to his returning to Pittsburg, they said, "go in peace."—Roberts, page 12.

And if Elder William Marks and others, who afterwards opposed the Twelve, acquiesced at the time, it can be easily explained. But more of this resolution, its interpretation, and effects when we come to treat directly the claims of Brigham Young and his colleagues. We have followed Mr. Roberts in his comments regarding the movement under Rigdon, not because we have any sympathy with the claims of Elder Rigdon, but for the purpose of correcting certain misrepresentations because of the influence they might have upon the discussion of the question of Succession, which is the leading issue between us.

CHAPTER 2.

WILLIAM SMITH—SLANDERED BY ROBERTS—SUSPENDED FROM OFFICE—RESTORED—SUSTAINED—ORDAINED A PATRIARCH—HIGHLY COMMENDED—ROBERTS ERRS CONCERNING HIM—PREACHES LINEAL PRIESTHOOD—BRIGHAMITES EXPEL HIM—LUCY SMITH ET AL. CONSIDERED.

MR. ROBERTS next introduces the work of William Smith, the brother of the prophet; and, true to the disposition manifested by him throughout his treatise, commences with a slanderous statement, for which he cites no proof. It is as follows:—

> Following the attempt of Sidney Rigdon to become the "Guardian of the Church," we will consider the efforts of William Smith, brother to the prophet Joseph, to become its President. He was a member of the quorum of the Twelve at the death of the prophet, though for some time his conduct had been such as to bring him into disrepute among the Saints. He was of a turbulent, ungovernable disposition; a man of fierce passions and violent temper. When the saints were driven from Missouri, in 1838, and his brother Joseph cast into prison, such was his vindictiveness against the prophet that at a general conference of the church held near Quincy, Illinois, May 4th, 1839, he was suspended from fellowship; but was afterwards restored, mainly through the pleadings of that same brother against whom he railed with such bitterness of speech.—Roberts, p. 15.

He who seeks thus to prejudice a case against an opponent before the investigation begins, manifests an unbecoming spirit of bitterness or a conscious weakness; and when he afterwards assumes the role of a witness, as Mr. Roberts does in relating a personal interview with William Smith, we must consider and treat him as a prejudiced witness. The minutes of the conference of May 4, 1839, have this entry:—

Resolved 9th: That Elders Orson Hyde and William Smith be allowed the privilege of appearing personally before the next General Conference of the church, to give an account of their conduct; and that in the meantime they both be suspended from exercising the functions of their office.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 17, p. 204.

So when Mr. Roberts asserts that William Smith was suspended from *fellowship*, he misstates the case, and when he assumes to give the cause for this action he goes outside the record. By what authority these statements are made, we are left to conjecture.

In the History of Joseph Smith, under date of May 25, 1839, occurs the following:—

This day I met the Twelve in council. The case of Brother William Smith came up for investigation and was disposed of. —*Mill. Star*, Vol. 17, p. 232.

Not a word about Joseph Smith pleading for him; nor are we informed how the case was disposed of. He was no doubt either vindicated or forgiven, as we find in the October conference minutes of the same year, the following:—

Orson Hyde to stand in his former office, and William Smith to be continued in his standing.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 1, p. 30.

What a fruitful imagination Mr. Roberts has!

In the very next sentence after the one quoted above Mr. Roberts says:—

Shortly after the martyrdom of his brothers, Joseph and Hyrum, William was ordained to the office of patriarch to the church, to succeed Hyrum Smith, who held that office at the time of his death.

Rather an unfit man for Patriarch, if Mr. Roberts represents him fairly. But to add to this absurdity, Mr. Roberts, on page 18, returns to the attack, and says:—

William Smith, however, did not command much of a following in this first attempt to make himself a leader. His profligate life was too notorious in Nauvoo to make it possible for him to wield much influence even as a schismatic.

Is this the character of men that Mr. Young and his associates placed in responsible positions? It was they who ordained William Smith a patriarch. At or near the time of this ordination, when John Taylor, of the Twelve, was "Editor and Proprietor," the *Times and Seasons* had this to say editorially of William Smith:—

Father Smith, the first Patriarch, and Hyrum, his successor, conferred many blessings upon the saints that made their hearts glad. But they, in the wisdom of God, have been called away, and William, the son and brother, succeeds them. How many, now will say, I wish I had my patriarchal blessing? This has been the lamentation of many since the death of Joseph and Hyrum. William is the last of the family, and truly inherits the blood and spirit of his father's house, as well as priesthood and the patriarchal office from his father and brother, *legally*, and by *hereditary descent.—Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, p. 905.

Is this the way that disreputable and profligate characters are recommended by the church which Mr. Roberts represents?

In assuming to trace the career of William Smith, Mr. Roberts claims that after becoming estranged from the Twelve he set up claims to the Presidency in his own right, then became associated with James J. Strang, and—

After his failure in Nauvoo, and in Wisconsin in connection with Mr. Strang, we next hear of William Smith in the winter and spring of 1850, visiting those who had been members of the church in Illinois and Kentucky, teaching "lineal priesthood as applied to the Presidency of the church." That is, he taught that his brother Joseph's eldest son had a right by virtue of lineage to succeed to the Presidency of the church; but also taught in connection with this that it was his right as the only surviving brother of the former President, uncle and natural guardian of the "seed" of Joseph the prophet, to stand, in the *interim*, as president *pro tem* of the church.—Roberts, p. 23.

The inference conveyed in this language is that William Smith did not teach "lineal priesthood as applied to the Presidency of the church" until the winter of 1850. But

to make it clearer that Mr. Roberts does so affirm we quote a positive assertion found on page 65:—

> Not until 1850 did he begin to proclaim the right of "young Joseph" to be the President of the church; and then not by any virtue of appointment from his father, but by right of lineage; and with this movement on his part originates the claims of Mr. Smith to the Presidency.

That this statement is false appears from the following extract from a letter written from St. Louis, Missouri, November 22, 1845, by James Kay, and published in the *Millennial Star* for May 1, 1846:—

> Doubtless you will have heard of William Smith's apostasy. He is endeavoring to "make a raise" in this city. After he left Nauvoo he went to Galena, when he published a "proclamation" to the church, calling upon them to renounce the Twelve as an unauthorized, tyrannical, abominable, bloodthirsty set of scoundrels. I suppose you have his pamphlet. I did think to send one the day he landed here, but felt inclined to hear and see his course a little while. Reports were daily coming from east to west of William's unmanly conduct; sorry I was to hear them, they seemed so well authenticated. He contends the church is disorganized, having no head; that the Twelve are not, nor ever were, ordained to be head of the church; that Joseph's priesthood was to be conferred on his posterity to all future generations, and that young Joseph is the only legal successor to the presidency of this church, etc. G. J. Adams is William's right hand man, and comes out as little Joseph's spokesman; they intend holding a conference here this week and organizing the church on the old original plan, according to the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, Book of Mormon, and New Testament. Discussions are to take place between the Rigdonites and Josephites on the claims of each to the "Mormon Throne." Two high priests have been disfellowshiped, one seventy, and a number of other officers and members from this branch I suppose will join the Smith party.—Vol. 7, p. 134.

Here then is William Smith preaching lineal priesthood and the right of "young Joseph" to the Presidency, as early at least as the next month after action was taken against him by that faction of the church remaining at Nauvoo.

It was on the 6th of October, 1845, that the conference failed to sustain William Smith as one of the Twelve, and

as Patriarch (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, pp. 1008, 1009), and he was soon after expelled from their fellowship. What then becomes of Mr. Roberts' statement just preceding the one last above quoted, which is as follows?

> Had any idea prevailed at Nauvoo that "young Joseph" was to succeed to the Presidency of the church, this man, his uncle, would have known it; and would have strengthened his own claims at that time to the right of leadership, by proclaiming himself, as he did afterwards, in 1850, the natural guardian of the one who had been anointed and ordained to succeed to the office of President. But this he did not do. On the contrary, he claimed the place for himself by virtue of being the *brother* of the prophet. When he failed to secure the position of leadership for himself, he followed the leadership of James J. Strang instead of supporting the claims of "young Joseph."

Certainly he would have known it; he did know it, and immediately proclaimed it. Nothing but ignorance of history, or a willful desire to deceive, would lead a man to blunder as Mr. Roberts has blundered in the above. In either case, is he the proper man to "preserve from error those not acquainted with . . . the facts of church history"?

We do not appear as an apologist for Elder William Smith. We neither approve nor deny much that is said of him by Mr. Roberts and his associates; but enough has been said to show that neither he nor anyone else could consistently be condemned by the inaccurate evidence and false statements of Mr. Roberts.

In regard to Mr. Roberts' labored effort to convict Lucy Smith, the mother of the prophet, and others, of indorsing the claims of William Smith, we have but little to say. Mr. Roberts relies solely upon extracts from the private journal of John Taylor to sustain his allegation. We have not access to Mr. Taylor's journal, so cannot give this testimony a thorough examination; but after a careful examination of Mr. Roberts' work we cannot accept as conclusive his presentation of the evidence.

Again, it seems strange that if this is true no evidence is brought, except from this one private source. And again, if we admit it all to be true, what is there in it? Suppose that Lucy Smith et al. did indorse the claims of Elder William Smith, it does not prove that they had heard no other claims. Besides, as we have shown, William Smith's position then (June, 1845,) or soon after, was that of lineal priesthood. Mr. Roberts could have spared himself the mortification of "quoting" "this good and noble woman," for he has accomplished nothing by it.

CHAPTER 3.

WIGHT AND MILLER—WIGHT'S CHARACTER—ROBERTS' BLUNDER—WIGHT GOES TO WISCONSIN—HIS RECORD—HIS FOLLOWERS—GALVESTON NEWS' TRIBUTE—MILLER—HIS REASON FOR LEAVING FORMER ASSOCIATIONS—HEWETT'S LETTER.

IN his third chapter Mr. Roberts introduces Lyman Wight and George Miller, as follows:—

It can scarcely be said that either Lyman Wight or Bishop George Miller sought to lead the church; but they were guilty of insubordination to the constituted authorities and lead [led] away parties with them, and illustrate the truth of President Young's prediction about the failure of such persons, hence we consider their course.—Roberts, p. 26.

Here Mr. Roberts makes his characteristic mistake of assuming the point at issue by concluding that the authorities whom Elder Wight and Bishop Miller opposed were properly in authority. With the same reckless assumption he continues:—

Lyman Wight was a strong, bold man; fixed in his friendship for the prophet Joseph, and true to him under many trying circumstances; but withal rather difficult to control, and after the death of Joseph soon manifested a disposition of insubordination to authority.—Ibid.

What caused this "strong, bold man," this man "difficult to control," to be fixed in his friendship and true to the prophet Joseph? Such characters are not controlled by fear or easily moved by influences. There is but one solution; viz.: Lyman Wight fully and sincerely indorsed the doctrine preached and the policy pursued by Joseph Smith. If then Mr. Roberts' estimate of the man is correct, it follows that if these so-called "constituted authorities" had been preaching the doctrine and following the

policy which he had so ardently espoused, Lyman Wight would have been fixed in his friendship and true to them.

Mr. Roberts continues:—

As far back as February, 1844, he had expressed a desire to go to Texas, and after the death of the prophet seemed determined that the church should be removed there. For some time a number of persons had worked under his and Bishop George Miller's direction in the pineries of Wisconsin, getting out lumber for the Temple. In the latter part of August, 1844, President Young desired him to return to the pineries and continue his labors; but he refused and expressed a determination to carry out his own views, and be the controller of his own conduct regardless of the counsel of the presiding quorum. He therefore went to Texas instead of to Wisconsin, taking a small company of saints with him and settling in Texas, not far from the present site of Austin.—Roberts, p. 26.

So far as the issues between us are concerned, it does not make a particle of difference whether Lyman Wight went to Texas or to Wisconsin; but to show the utter unreliability of this champion of "the order of the priesthood of God and facts of church history," we will quote briefly from the journal of Lyman Wight, now before us. It is true that he and Bishop George Miller had been directing a company in getting out lumber in the pineries in Wisconsin, but he returned to Nauvoo about April 20, 1844, and at the time of the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith he was with others of the Twelve in the Eastern States. He again returned to Nauvoo, arriving August 6, 1844. In his journal under date of March 17, 1845, is this entry:—

From the 6th day of August, 1844, until the 28th, I was making preparation to start on the mission appointed unto me previous to my going to the city of Washington. Accordingly, on the 28th of August, I left Nauvoo accompanied by one hundred and sixty-four persons on board the steamer General Brooke, and landed at Prairie La Cross [Wisconsin], up the Mississippi River four hundred and fifty miles above Nauvoo, on the first day of September, 1844. From that time until the present we have been engaged in cutting wood, laboring in the pinery, and at various kinds of business to procure a living.

So he did go to the pineries just when Mr. Roberts says he refused to go; not by request of Elder Young, but to fulfill a mission previously given him.

If Mr. Roberts disputes the above we are ready to furnish names of men who were in this expedition, some of whom are communicants of the church which Mr. Roberts represents.

Again, Mr. Roberts says:—

> For his insubordination Lyman Wight was excommunicated from the church, the action being taken in Salt Lake City, 1848. The company of saints that followed him were soon scattered as sheep that have wandered from the fold and the care of the shepherd; but some few of them finally found their way back into the church. Lyman Wight lived in obscurity in Texas, unknown by the world, unhonored, without a following, and died outside the church of Christ, with which he had suffered so much during the persecutions it passed through in Missouri.—Roberts, pp. 26, 27.

As we have said of others, so we say of Elder Wight, we do not appear as his apologist. That he erred in some things, is conceded. But to more fully get the measure of Mr. Roberts, let us compare a few facts with the above statement: Elder Wight retained a considerable following until his death. In the spring of 1858 he started to move with this body to the northern States, when death overtook him, on March 31, of that year, at San Antonio, Texas. After his death the company continued their journey, still maintaining an organization; and though their numbers were diminished from time to time, the organization was not entirely extinct until it was absorbed by the Reorganization; when the most of its members, true to the teachings of Elder Wight on lineal priesthood, accepted the presidency of Joseph Smith, the son of the prophet. Some few left Lyman Wight's following at different times and went to Utah, but a part of them have returned and are now members of the Reorganization. Two of the posterity of Lyman Wight now occupy positions in the Quo-

rum of Twelve; two in the quorums of Seventy; several hold other offices; besides others of his followers hold responsible positions in the Reorganization.

At the time of Lyman Wight's death the Galveston *News*, then the leading paper in Texas, had this to say editorially of him and his following:—

> We believe we have omitted to notice the death of Mr. Lyman Wight, who for some thirteen years past has been the leader of a small and independent Mormon settlement in Texas. As far as we have been able to learn, these Mormons have proved themselves to be most excellent citizens of our State, and we are no doubt greatly indebted to the deceased leader for the orderly conduct, sobriety, industry, and enterprise of his colony. Mr. Wight first came to Texas in November, 1845, and has been with his colony on our extreme frontier ever since, moving still farther west as settlements formed around him, thus always being the pioneer of advancing civilization, affording protection against the Indians. He has been the first to settle five new counties, and prepare the way for others. He has at different times built three extensive saw and grist mills, etc.

How is this for living in obscurity, unknown to the world and unhonored and without a following? So far as his dying outside the church is concerned, that is begging the question again. Was it the church that expelled him? Where would this guardian of historic facts lead us if we were blind enough to follow?

Mr. Roberts' strictures on Bishop Miller are without material point, and the eloquent effusion with which he closes the chapter is only interesting on general principles. The application is farfetched.

It might be well, however, in this connection, to give Bishop Miller's version of why he separated from what Mr. Roberts is pleased to call the church. In June, 1849, Bishop Miller and Richard Hewett, then in Texas, each wrote a letter of inquiry to J. J. Strang, both writing on the same sheet of paper. (It is now before us.) Elder Hewett writes:—

Now I want to know what your mind is about men having the priesthood having more wives than one. The principle is taught amongst all that I have been with. Some have from 2 to 10 or 20, and some have none. If it is consistent I want you to let me know when you write to me, and I want you to write as soon as you get this so Brother Miller and myself will know what to do. You must excuse me for asking so much, but you must bear with me, as I confess I am ignorant. Bro. Miller says their whoring will send them all to hell. You can see Brother Hyrum's epistle to me on that subject in the *Times and Seasons*, 15th March, 1844, if I don't mistake. I don't find such things in the Book of Covenants, nor in the Book of Mormon, nor in the writings of the apostles, and I don't want to be deceived nor flattered any more.

Bishop Miller's statement, as given by Elder Hewett, is not elegant but very expressive, and gives us an idea of why he left Mr. Roberts' so-called church. The strong presumption is that when he penned these words Mr. Hewitt had not heard of the so-called revelation on polygamy, and if not, Bishop Miller, who writes on the same paper with Mr. Hewitt, certainly had not. It is rather an honor than a disgrace to be expelled from *some churches*, and if Bishop Miller was right, this is one of them. For an extract from Bishop Miller's letter here referred to, see Church History, Vol. 2, pp. 793, 794.

CHAPTER 4.

STRANG—CHALLENGES TAYLOR AND HYDE—THEIR REPLY—ROBERTS' UNMANLY ATTACK.

WE make these chapters to correspond in number with those of Mr. Roberts' for the sake of more ready reference, hence some will be very short. In his fourth chapter he treats of the work of J. J. Strang; but there is nothing in it to demand especial attention from us. This much can be said for Elder Strang—that he possessed the courage of his convictions and was both willing and anxious to discuss the issues between members of the Twelve who indorsed Brigham Young, and himself. And as these were living issues of the time, and as Mr. Roberts admits "he succeeded in deceiving many," it occurs to us that they should have been willing to have canvassed these points and thus protected those who were being deceived. Instead of this they adopted that craven, cowardly policy which they have followed ever since, of refusing to meet their opponents in honorable controversy, while boasting loudly of their own pretensions and seeking to slander their competitors.

Mr. Strang wrote two of their number, respectfully inviting a public investigation. They penciled a reply upon the same sheet of paper and returned it. In that reply they scarcely maintained the dignity of gentlemen, to say nothing of apostles of Jesus Christ. That paper is now before us and reads as follows:—

PHILADELPHIA, August 30, 1846.

Messrs. J. Taylor and Orson Hyde:—

Knowing from your public proceedings, as well as otherwise, that you and others appointed with you, claim the right and

are attempting to use the power of dictating all the affairs of the Church of Jesus Christ in all the world, not under the direction of the First Presidency thereof, but independently, I suggest to you the propriety of your publicly showing by what means you are authorized to act as leaders of said church, and offer to publicly discuss that question with you in this city or any other proper place that will suit your convenience. Your answer to this left at the house of Jacob Gibson, N. E. corner of Third and Dock St., near the Post Office, will receive immediate attention. Most respectfully,

JAMES J. STRANG.

Sir:—After Lucifer was cut off and thrust down to hell, we have no knowledge that God condescended to investigate the subject or right of authority with him. Your case has been disposed of by the authorities of the church. Being satisfied with our own power and calling, we have no disposition to ask from whence yours came. Respectfully,

ORSON HYDE.
JOHN TAYLOR.

With this we dismiss Mr. Roberts' work, so far as it relates to J. J. Strang, with merely the suggestion, that after Elders Hyde and Taylor had thus declined to meet him while living, it is unmanly for Mr. Roberts, while representing the same organization, to attack him when dead.

CHAPTER 5.

HISTORY OF REORGANIZATION—BRIGGS' PRIESTHOOD—TWELVE AT NAUVOO—ROBERTS' SARCASM—PIERCY ON SMITH FAMILY—PRESIDENT SMITH'S PLEDGE—ROBERTS' PHILOSOPHY.

MR. ROBERTS devotes this chapter to what he terms the history of the Reorganization. Though there are some inaccuracies in his statements we will not here pause to follow him minutely, as the facts of history will come out in the investigation of the issues. However, there are a few points which may demand a consideration as we pass along.

On page 42 of his work Mr. Roberts makes the following statement:—

> This alleged revelation was given on the 20th of March, 1853, and at the April conference following an organization was effected on the above indicated plan. After a long discussion, about whose priesthood was the highest—in the course of which a great deal of ill-feeling was manifested—finally the controversy ended in favor of Mr. Briggs, and he was called to preside at the conference.

The above is misleading in this: it indicates that the decision was that Elder Briggs held the highest priesthood. The facts were as follows: They were commanded to choose seven to form a majority of the Quorum of Twelve, and the instruction provided that the senior of the seven should preside, or stand as the representative, not by virtue of the priesthood which he had formerly held, but by virtue of his apostleship then conferred. He did not hold a higher priesthood than the other six, but by virtue of being chosen he was the senior among them.

There was doubtless much misunderstanding and some confusion and feeling manifested, but the final conclusion

was in harmony with the law; for as the Twelve were the highest in authority present, it was proper that their senior or president should preside or stand as the chief representative until higher authority came.

Some may inquire, Why do you then object to the Twelve presiding at Nauvoo after the death of Joseph Smith? The cases were different. In the one under consideration none of the First Presidency were present; at Nauvoo there was one of that quorum among them. Again, we do not object to the Twelve presiding at Nauvoo, or elsewhere, under proper circumstances; but when they do so preside it should be in their *own calling*, and not by assuming, as they did at Nauvoo, to be the First Presidency. In saying this we do not wish to be understood as advocating the right of Sidney Rigdon to preside at Nauvoo. The truth is that neither Rigdon nor the majority of the Twelve were content to preside in his or their calling, but each aspired to honors and position not guaranteed by the law.

On page 44 Mr. Roberts makes the following sarcastic, but characteristically contemptible statement:—

> Meantime Joseph Smith who, according to his own autobiography, had failed as storekeeper, railroad contractor, in the study of law, in farming, and while keeping soul and body together by labor and from his fees as justice of the peace, was confronted with the question of his connection with his "father's work;" and in the winter of 1859, resolved to put himself in communication with the "reorganized church."

For confirmation of this statement he refers us to the autobiography of Joseph Smith in the "Life of Joseph the Prophet," by Tullidge, pp. 743–773. While it is true that Joseph Smith was not very successful in some of these enterprises, anyone who will take the trouble to read the reference will see that Mr. Roberts has overdrawn the picture for the evident purpose of casting a slur.

In consideration of this effort to reflect upon Joseph

Smith we will here quote a statement from the Utah people regarding Joseph Smith and the Smith family, from one of their own works published a few years before the time referred to by Mr. Roberts. The following is from the "Illustrated Route from Liverpool to Salt Lake Valley." Frederick Piercy, by arrangement with S. W. Richards, made a trip from Liverpool to Salt Lake in 1853–54 to make sketches for this work. It was edited by James Linforth and published at Liverpool, by F. D. Richards, in 1855. Mr. Piercy visited Nauvoo enroute, and among other things says:—

While in Nauvoo I lodged at the Nauvoo Mansion, formerly the residence of Joseph Smith, and now occupied by his mother, his widow, and her family. I could not fail to regard the old lady with great interest. Considering her age and afflictions, she, at that time, retained her faculties to a remarkable degree. She spoke very freely of her sons, and, with tears in her eyes, and every other symptom of earnestness, vindicated their reputations for virtue and truth. During my two visits I was able to take her portrait, and the portraits of two of her grandsons also. That of Joseph, the eldest son, was done on his 21st birth-day. He was born about 2 o'clock in the morning of the 6th of November, 1832, at Kirtland, Ohio. He is a young man of a most excellent disposition and considerable intelligence. One prominent trait in his character is his affection for his mother. I particularly noticed tha this conduct towards her was always most respectful and attentive. The other portrait is of David, the youngest son, who was born five months after the assassination of his father. He was born about 9 o'clock in the morning of the 17th of November, 1844. He is of a mild, studious disposition, and is passionately fond of drawing, seeming to be never so happy as when he has a pencil and paper in his hand. The other two boys whom I saw, were very fine, strong, healthy fellows, and as it may be interesting to many, I will say, that during some conversations which I had with persons in the neighborhood, I found that the whole family had obtained a most excellent reputation for integrity and industry.—Pages 63–66.

Considering the amount of prejudice at Nauvoo against the Smith family and the church, this is a good showing. But Mr. Roberts must sneer. It is a manifestation of his nature or education.

On pages 46 and 47 Mr. Roberts quotes some detached extracts from President Smith's speech of acceptance of April 6, 1860, and especially criticises these words, as extracted therefrom:—

I pledge myself to promulgate no doctrine that shall not be approved by you, or the code of good morals.

Mr. Roberts' criticism is based upon the thought that a prophet should not be governed except by revelation to himself, and should not be bound by the voice of the body. He evidently has overlooked the fact that God himself does not force upon the church an edict without consent of the church. In the revelation of 1841 he names the men who should fill the leading offices in the church, and then adds:—

And a commandment I give unto you that you should fill all these offices and approve of those names which I have mentioned, or else disapprove of them, at my general conference, etc.—D. C. 107:46.

According to this, God himself would not force upon the church that which it did not approve; but Mr. Roberts' ideal prophet would have no regard to church approval. He has perhaps overlooked the further fact that according to Orson Hyde, Joseph the Seer had established a rule that revelations were to be approved by the quorums ere they were promulgated.

Mr. Hyde says:—

There is a way by which all revelations purporting to be from God through any man can be tested. Brother Joseph gave us the plan, says he, when all the quorums are assembled and organized in order, let the revelation be presented to the quorums, if it pass one let it go to another, and if it pass that, to another, and so on until it has passed all the quorums; and if it pass the whole without running against a snag, you may know it is of God. But if it runs against a snag, then says he, it wants enquiring into: you must see to it. It is known to some who are present that there is a quorum organized where revelations can be tested. Brother Joseph said, let no revelation go to the people until it has been tested here.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, pp. 649, 650.

Mr. Roberts also fails to notice the positive assertion of President Smith as follows:—

> I have come in obedience to a power not my own, and shall be dictated by the power that sent me.

This indicates that he would not submit to any power other than the one that sent him, though he, as President of the church, would not *promulgate* any doctrine until approved.

Mr. Roberts should not overlook the further fact that Mr. Smith when he made the pledge complained of was acquainted with the views of those with whom he was to associate, as appears from these words found in his speech:—

> I have my peculiar notions in regard to revelations, but am happy to say that they accord with those I am to associate with, at least with those of them with whom I have conversed.

Again, it is evident from the following words connected with the statement complained of, "or the code of good *morals*," that he had in his mind the fact that many of this people had been deceived by leaders who had stealthily introduced polygamy and other immoral practices; and he wished to assure them that they had nothing of this nature to fear from him. He has been true to that assurance.

Further, the son of the Prophet knew that after the death of his father several of those who had assumed the self-imposed task of leading the church had taught doctrines and practices which the code of good morals condemns; and he, feeling the necessity of putting a moral safeguard into the pledge which he felt called upon to make in accepting the position offered to him at Amboy, deliberately stated his determination not to teach, promulgate, or attempt to fasten upon the tenets of the church, dogmas, teaching, or practices which would not be approved by a righteous people, or could not be approved upon the appli-

cation to them of the requirements of the "code of good morals."

When it is understood that the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the revelations in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, were the acknowledged basis of the faith of the church in the martyred Joseph's time, and the accepted source from which the code of good morals for the church, including the church in Utah and the Reorganization is derived, the statement made by the son of the Martyr on that April day in 1860 to the people to whom he was sent by the voice of the Spirit, was a strong, not a weak pledge; was a safe, and not a compromising statement; one which reflected honor and not disgrace upon the name of his father; and a statement and pledge which all good, all decent-minded citizens of the world, and all Latter Day Saints of every shade of belief ought to accept in good faith and give "young Joseph" credit for being strong enough to make it.

Mr. Roberts then seeks to draw a contrast between this position of President Smith's and that assigned to his father in the following:—

> Wherefore, meaning the church, thou shalt give heed unto all his words, and commandments, which he shall give unto you, as he receiveth them, walking in all holiness before me; for his word ye shall receive, as if from mine own mouth, in all patience and faith; for by doing these things, the gates of hell shall not prevail against you; yea, and the Lord God will disperse the powers of darkness from before you, and cause the heavens to shake for your good, and his name's glory.—Doctrine and Covenants 19: 2.

The reader will observe that the church was to receive his words as he received them from God, "*walking in all holiness*" before him; but according to the rule quoted above, the church was guaranteed the right to be satisfied that he had so received them, and they were not to be promulgated until approved.

Brigham Young's words, quoted in this connection, by Mr. Roberts, only reveal the boastful spirit of the man.

Mr. Roberts closes this chapter with the following peculiar paragraph:—

> We have now followed the history of the "Reorganized church" as far as it is necessary. It only remains to remark that it is a stream formed by the confluence of two other streams; one of which, represented by Mr. Gurley and his following, flows from Strangism; and the other, represented by Mr. Briggs and his following, flows from the church organized by William Smith. We leave it for Josephites to inform us on what principle of philosophy two corrupt, apostate streams by uniting, make a pure one!

This conclusion is evidently based upon the supposition that when parties come out of one organization to affiliate with another, the one they leave becomes a part of the one to which they adhere.

How profound! According to this philosophy the church organized by Joseph Smith and others from 1830 to 1835, was a stream formed by the confluence of several other streams issuing from the several sectarian churches.

It may be said that the parties composing the former organization renounced their allegiance to other churches; but so did the parties composing the Reorganization. Emphatic as were the memorable words of the personage who addressed Joseph Smith, when he was told that he "must join none of them, for they were all wrong, and . . . their creeds were an abomination," they are no more emphatic than the words of revelation to Zenos H. Gurley:—

> Rise up, cast off *all* that claim to be prophets, and go forth and preach the gospel, and say that God will raise up a prophet to complete his work.

The following resolution, adopted June 13, 1852, has no uncertain sound:—

> *Resolved*, That this Conference regard the pretentions of Brigham Young, James J. Strang, James Collen Brewster, and William Smith and Joseph Wood's joint claims to the leadership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, as an assump-

tion of power, in violation of the law of God; and consequently we disclaim all connection and fellowship with them.—*The Messenger*, Vol. 2, p. 9.

What a wonderful acquisition this man Roberts will make to the United States Congress, if he succeeds in getting there. He can inform his illustrious colleagues that this government is a stream formed by the confluence of several corrupt streams which flow from all the despotic and priest-ridden monarchies of Europe. And we are called upon to reply to such profound philosophy. Lest such heights make us dizzy, we will just come down and simply inform Mr. Roberts that neither now nor at any time in the past has the Reorganization been composed of Strangites and William Smithites. Though some who were once associated with them have united with us, this is also true as regards members coming from the Brighamites and from every other society in the country, while many have come to us from the world.

CHAPTER 6.

WIGHT'S TESTIMONY—GOES TO WISCONSIN—ROBERTS' THEORY FALSE—SMITH AND WIGHT TEACH LINEAL PRIESTHOOD—STRANGITE RESOLUTION—"YOUNG JOSEPH'S" BLESSINGS—HIS STATEMENT—REVELATION OF 1841—JOSEPH'S BLESSING—WHITEHEAD'S TESTIMONY—TESTIMONY OF EMMA SMITH—G. J. ADAMS ON LINEAGE—CARTER'S TESTIMONY—WITNESSES NOT IMPEACHED—BISHOP MILLER—HYRUM SMITH'S ORDINATION—LAW OF LINEAGE—JOSEPH SMITH ON DESCENT—CALHOUN LETTER—CALL BY REVELATION—REORGANIZATION APPROVED—RICHARDS' CORRESPONDENCE—ORDINATION OF PRESIDENT SMITH—RIGHTS OF APPOINTMENT.

MR. ROBERTS begins his criticism in this chapter by quoting the testimony of Lyman Wight as published in some publications of the Reorganized Church, as follows:—

In the private journal of Lyman Wight, ... this is found: "Sunday, December 8th, 1850, bore testimony that Joseph Smith appointed those of his own posterity to be his successor."

And in a letter he wrote in July, 1855, from Medina river, Texas, to the *Northern Islander*, a Strangite paper, Brother Wight said: Now Mr. Editor, if you had been present *when Joseph called on me shortly after we came out of jail*, [Liberty jail, Missouri.—Ed.] to lay hands with him on the head of a youth, and heard him cry aloud, "you are my successor when I depart." and heard the blessings poured on his head,—I say had you heard all this, and seen the tears streaming from his eyes—you would not have been led [into following Strang] by blind fanaticism, or a zeal without knowledge.—Roberts, p. 50.

Upon this Mr. Roberts comments as follows:—

Of this testimony it is to be said, first on the entry in Mr. Wight's journal, that it is too general in its character to be of much service in supporting the claims of "young Joseph." We are not certain that he refers to him at all. Then if Lyman Wight knew in 1850 that Joseph the prophet had blessed his son Joseph to be his successor, as prophet and president of the church, Mr. Wight knew it in 1844; and is it not strange that he did not speak of it and advocate it when

the question of a successor was warmly discussed in Nauvoo, during the autumn of 1844? Why is it that we have nothing from him on the subject earlier than 1850? And this silence on the part of Mr. Wight is the more significant when it is remembered that he was a bold, fearless man. It cannot be said in truth, that Brigham Young's influence was so masterly as to awe him into silence. As a matter of fact he violently opposed Brigham Young in some of his measures, and at last rebelled against him; but nothing is said by him until 1850, about the appointment of any of the prophet's posterity to succeed to the presidency of the church.—Ibid. pp. 50, 51.

It would be difficult for anyone to make more blunders in the same space than Mr. Roberts has made in the above comment. If he is so obtuse after all that has been published as to fail to understand who is referred to in Elder Wight's journal, he might read the following from a manuscript of Elder Wight's now in our possession, dated December, 1851, and published in Church History, Vol. 2, p. 791:—

> The fifties assembled should have called on all the authorities of the church down to the lay-members from all the face of the earth, as much as was convenient, and after having taken sweet counsel together, in prayer and supplication before God, acknowledged our sins and transgressions which had caused our head to be taken from our midst; and then have called on young Joseph, and held him up before the congregation of Israel to take his father's place in the flesh.

Elder Wight was not at Nauvoo in 1844, as we have seen, after the death of Joseph Smith, except from August 6 to August 28. Certainly Elder Wight knew as much of this blessing in 1844 as he did in 1850; and if, as Mr. Roberts asserts, he "violently opposed Brigham Young in some of his measures," may not this have been one of the points of disagreement? If not, what did they disagree about?

But Mr. Roberts says, and repeats it, that Lyman Wight said nothing on the subject of Joseph's posterity succeeding him *until 1850.* Again Mr. Roberts is wrong. In the *Gospel Herald,* Strang's organ, published at Voree, Wis-

consin, in its issue for August 31, 1848, is the following comment:—

> Lyman Wight seems to cherish the idea that is ignorantly held out by some others, that Joseph, the prophet's son, will yet come up and take his father's original place in the church as the prophet to the church; whereas there is not one single word in all the book of Doctrine and Covenants to warrant the idea.—Prophetic Controversy, No. 2, p. 17.

Mr. Roberts has a theory that the claims of Joseph Smith to the Presidency originated with the movement of William Smith in 1850 (see p. 18), and seems determined to make everything bend to the support of that theory; hence he asserts in positive terms, both of William Smith and Lyman Wight, that they did not teach lineal priesthood as applied to the Presidency until 1850. We have exploded this theory by showing that William Smith is on record on that subject as early as November, 1845; and we have now shown that Lyman Wight was criticised as early as August, 1848, for teaching that Joseph Smith's posterity would succeed him; and he must have been teaching this theory some time prior to this date, for news did not travel rapidly in those days from the frontiers of Texas to Wisconsin.

We present the fact that these two members of the Quorum of the Twelve preached this so soon after their difference with the quorum, as strong presumptive evidence that this was one of the points upon which the difference arose. It must be remembered that neither William Smith nor Lyman Wight at that time had control of a press by which to preserve on record their views, and we are dependent upon statements of their opponents. The *Times and Seasons*, controlled by the Twelve and published in Nauvoo, Illinois, carefully avoids stating what the issues were.

It leaks out, however, through the *Millennial Star*, published in England, in the case of William Smith, and

through the *Gospel Herald*, published in Wisconsin, in the case of Lyman Wight, that at least one of their contentions was that the posterity of Joseph Smith should succeed to the Presidency. Here then are two of the Quorum of the Twelve opposing the usurpations of their quorum from the beginning.

Nor were they alone in this. The above quotation states:—

> Lyman Wight seems to cherish the idea that is ignorantly held out by *some others*, etc.

We are not told who those some others were nor how many there were of them, but it is evident that the feeling that "young Joseph" was appointed to some special position was quite strong, even among Elder Strang's followers, notwithstanding the adverse comment above quoted; for at their General Conference held in Voree, Wisconsin, April, 1849, the following resolution was presented and passed unanimously:—

> That we give our prayers daily for Joseph, the son of Joseph, that he may be raised up of God to fill the station to which he has been called by prophecy.—*Gospel Herald*, Vol. 4, p. 16.

These evidences leave Mr. Roberts in a very unenviable position as an exponent of "the facts of church history;" and his theory that "the claims of Mr. Smith to the Presidency" originated with the movement of 1850 is pitiably at fault. Will Mr. Roberts, like an honest man, abandon that theory, and confess his error?

He next seeks to impeach the testimony of Lyman Wight by referring to a statement that Lyman Wight was said to have taught that "young Joseph" was blessed by his father while in Liberty jail, Missouri, and comparing that with the statement quoted above that he blessed him shortly after he came out of jail. This he claims is a discrepancy in time and place. It is only necessary in this connection to say that the evidence shows that Joseph Smith,

the Prophet, blessed his son Joseph both *in* Liberty jail and *after he came out*, and Lyman Wight was with him both in jail and after his escape and arrival in Illinois; hence both statements may have been correct.

As evidence that two blessings were given, or rather the same blessing pronounced at two different *times* and *places*, corresponding with the statements of Elder Wight, read the following from the pen of President Smith, published in October, 1868:—

In Liberty jail the promise and blessing of a life of usefulness to the cause of truth was pronounced upon our head, by lips tainted by dungeon damps, and by the Spirit confirmed through attesting witnesses.

This blessing has by some been called an ordination, from the usual predilection to confound names and terms.

The blessing which marked Moses as the deliverer from Egyptian bondage, was not that which Jethro pronounced upon his head.

Subsequent to our baptism in 1843, upon two occasions was the same blessing confirmed by Joseph Smith, once in the council room in the brick store on the banks of the Mississippi, of which we have not a doubt there are witnesses who would confirm the present testimony; once, in the last interview Joseph Smith held with his family before he left Nauvoo to his death. A public attestation of the same blessing was made from the stand in the grove in Nauvoo, some time prior to the murder in Carthage.—*True Latter Day Saints' Herald*, Vol. 14, p. 105.

In the light of these facts these quibbles of Mr. Roberts amount to contemptible pettifoggery. After making another unsupported, slanderous statement, Mr. Roberts seeks to throw discredit upon the testimony published in the *Northern Islander*, in 1855, by affirming that this is not corroborated by Caleb Baldwin and Alexander McRae who were in the jail at the time, and who have left nothing on record regarding the occurrence. In answer we ask, If the statement published in 1855 was untrue, why did not Alexander McRae (who we believe was then living) contradict it? His silence was a tacit acknowledgement of its correctness.

Mr. Roberts' next attack is in the following language:—

(2) Mr. Smith further claims that he was called to be President of the church through his father by revelation in 1841.

The revelation referred to was given the 19th of January, 1841. The passage in it supposed to sustain the claim of appointment of "young Joseph" to be the President of the church is the following:

And now I say unto you, as pertaining to my boarding house which I have commanded you to build for the boarding of strangers, let it be built unto my name, and let my name be named upon it, and let my servant Joseph, and his house have place therein, from generation to generation; for this anointing have I put upon his head, that his blessing shall also be put upon the head of his posterity after him, and as I said unto Abraham concerning the kindreds of the earth, even so I say unto my servant Joseph, in thee and in thy seed shall the kindred of the earth be blessed. Therefore let my servant Joseph and his seed after him have place in that house, from generation to generation, for ever and for ever, saith the Lord.

This is not difficult to comprehend as it stands thus in the Doctrine and Covenants unmarred. It is simply this: a commandment was given to build the Nauvoo House, a tavern, for the boarding and lodging of strangers. Joseph Smith and his family were also to have a home therein; for he was commanded to put stock in the house, and as a matter of fact did put considerable stock into it; and his family after him, from generation to generation, was to have that inheritance in the house. It was to be theirs because the prophet Joseph had purchased the stock which secured to him, and his posterity after him, the right of a home within it. The passage does not in any manner refer to succession in the Presidency of the church. What it does refer to is clearly seen in the commencement of the paragraph—"And now I say unto you, *as pertaining to my boarding house, which I have commanded you to build for the boarding of strangers, etc.*" That is the subject of the passage, not the priesthood, nor the succession of the prophet Joseph's son to his father's position as President of the church. How absurd the argument that because a man's posterity are to inherit his stock in a hotel, or succeed to the right of living in it as a return for having paid a large sum towards the construction of it, that therefore we must conclude that it means, too, that a man's posterity or at least the "head" of it—the eldest son—must also inherit the father's priesthood and calling as President of the church!—Roberts, pp. 53, 54.

Suppose we admit that the subject of this passage is the Nauvoo House, and that a special provision was made that Joseph Smith and his family were to have place therein from generation to generation; then the inquiry is pertinent, Why was this provision made? If we understand Mr. Roberts, his position is that it was because Joseph Smith held stock in the house and the Lord was providing that his posterity should succeed to his property rights. This was provided for by the laws of the land, and why should the Lord interfere in such a matter? The law of the land would also protect the property rights of the heirs of every other stockholder in that institution. If this is all he intended to do, why did he make a specialty of the family of Joseph Smith? Were their property rights more in jeopardy than the rights of hundreds of others? There must have been some *special* reason why his family should have a place in that house. That reason will become clear by quoting the remainder of the paragraph from which Mr. Roberts quotes but a part. Mr. Roberts' quotation ends at a comma. Commencing at the beginning of the sentence which he breaks and continuing it reads:—

> Therefore, let my servant Joseph, and his seed after him, have place in that house, from generation to generation, forever and ever, saith the Lord, and let the name of that house be called the Nauvoo House; and let it be a delightful habitation for man, and a resting place for the weary traveler, that he may contemplate the glory of Zion, and the glory of this the corner stone thereof; that he may receive also the counsel from those whom I have set to be as plants of renown, and as watchmen upon her walls.—D. C. 107: 18.

Here we have the purpose of the house described as being a resting place for the "weary traveler, that he may contemplate the glory of Zion, and the glory of this the corner stone thereof; *that he may receive also the counsel from those whom I have set to be as plants of renown, and as watch-*

men upon her walls." This being the purpose of the house, does it not follow that those whom God decreed should remain in the house, notwithstanding their property rights were no better than others, were "set to be as plants of renown and as watchmen" upon the walls of Zion? Some one may ask, Could they not "be as plants of renown, and as watchmen" without being in the Presidency? In a general sense they might be; but this indicates that their counsel was to be in a *special* manner sought by the investigator. Why should they be thus specially pointed out and located where their counsel could be had unless their position was to be a special one? Had Nauvoo been built up according to the command of God this provision would doubtless now be in force.

Let us now return to that part of the quotation furnished us by Mr. Roberts: "Let my servant Joseph, and his house have place therein, from generation to generation." Why? Because they have property rights? Their rights in this respect are just as good, but no better than others. Let the Lord tell us why: "*for* this anointing have I put upon his head, *that* his blessing shall also be put upon the head of his posterity after him." Then to remain in the house was not the blessing, but they were to remain in the house because of the conditions attaching to the blessing. What blessing were the posterity to have? *Joseph's blessing.* What was his blessing? The Lord gave a commandment on the very day the church was organized, April 6, 1830, and gave instruction that a record should be kept and that Joseph in that record should "be called a seer, a translator, a prophet, and an apostle of Jesus Christ," etc. (D. C. 19: 1.)

Again, the duty of the president of the office of the high priesthood is to preside over the whole church, and to be like unto Moses. Behold, here is wisdom, yea, to be a seer, a revelator, a translator, and a prophet; having all the gifts of God which he bestows upon the head of the church.—D. C. 104: 42.

Here then is the blessing given to Joseph to occupy in this position, and to discharge these duties and responsibilities. But some one objects that this is not called a "blessing;" but is it not a blessing? However, to silence this caviling we refer the reader to the blessing of Joseph Smith as pronounced by his father on the occasion of the ordination of the High Council, February 19, 1834. Joseph in his history says:—

"My father Joseph then laid his hands upon my head and said, 'Joseph, I lay my hands upon thy head and pronounce the *blessings* of thy progenitors upon thee, that thou mayest hold the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, until the coming of the Lord; amen.'"—Church History, Vol. 1, p. 433; *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, pp. 994, 995.

Here the doctrine of lineal descent is recognized for the right to "hold the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" belonged to Joseph's progenitors, and descended to him. Now mark you, "*his blessing shall also* be put *upon the head of his posterity after him.*" So we have it clearly defined that the blessing of Joseph's progenitors was conferred on Joseph that he might "hold the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven;" and this blessing was to descend unto his posterity. Now what position in the church does this blessing guarantee? Hear what the Lord said to Frederick G. Williams in March, 1832:—

Hearken to the calling wherewith you are called, even to be a high priest in my church, and a counselor unto my servant, Joseph Smith, Jr., unto whom I have given the keys of the kingdom, which belongeth always unto the presidency of the high priesthood; etc.—D. C. 80:1.

The question as to whether this special blessing always comes to the *eldest* son is not an issue between us and the people of Utah, hence it is idle to discuss it here. We agree that it was bestowed upon Joseph Smith the Martyr, and the above shows clearly that it should be in his posterity.

Summarizing the points in the paragraph under examination we get the following:—

1. The boarding house is the subject under consideration.

2. Joseph Smith's family was to have place in that house from generation to generation, forever and ever.

3. The reason for this is that they were to inherit their father's blessing.

4. That blessing entitles them to hold the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.

5. These keys belong always unto the presidency of the high priesthood.

6. Hence the presidency should be in Joseph's posterity.

We grant that all these hereditary rights are contingent upon efficiency and worthiness, and a man or family may be removed from his or their place for transgression or unfaithfulness. But these disabilities must be proved, not assumed, in order to deprive one of his rights under the law.

Again, when it is considered that this revelation compares the blessing of Joseph Smith with that of Abraham, and affirms that in Joseph Smith and his seed "shall the kindred of the earth be blessed," how poor and mean appears the idea of Mr. Roberts and his echo, C. W. Penrose, that

it has not the remotest application to Priesthood, or Presidency, or succession in anything, but the right of Joseph the Prophet and his posterity to have place in that house.—Priesthood and Presidency, by Penrose, p. 15.

Mr. Roberts resumes, as follows:—

(3) Mr. Smith claims that he was called through his father to be President of the church by a formal anointing in a council at Nauvoo, in 1844.

In support of this claim Josephites quote only the testimony of Mr. James Whitehead, who resides at Lamoni, Iowa, and who is said to have been one of the secretaries of Joseph the

prophet. It is said of him rather than by him, that for the past twenty and more years he has

Testified publicly that he personally knew that Joseph the seer, in the presence of a number of the ministry, in Nauvoo, anointed and set apart his son Joseph to be his successor in the prophetic office and Presidency of the church, and that soon after the seer announced publicly from the stand, on a Sunday, that his son Joseph would be his successor.—Roberts, p. 55.

When Mr. Roberts penned the words, "Josephites quote only the testimony of Mr. James Whitehead," etc., he evidently had forgotten that which he quotes on next page from the pen of Joseph Smith, as follows:—

Of this alleged anointing in 1844, when Mr. Smith was a lad twelve years of age, he himself can only say:

Before the death of my father and uncle Hyrum, I was blessed by the first, in the presence of quite a number of then prominent Elders in the Church, this blessing being confirmed just prior to the tragedy at Carthage.

Upon this statement Mr. Roberts comments as follows:—

This is the only personal statement of his that I have ever seen in all the writings of the Josephites in regard to his ordination and blessing by his father, and it appears that he has no recollection of the nature of this "blessing;" if he was anointed and blessed to be the future prophet and President of the church, he evidently has no recollection of it, etc.

This is not the fault of "the writings of the Josephites," but the fault of Mr. Roberts' information. We have already quoted in these pages another and fuller statement from the pen of President Smith published as early as 1868, (see p. 40). If we are to be held responsible for what Mr. Roberts has not seen, our case is indeed a hopeless one. In regard to the testimony of James Whitehead and Emma Smith, Mr. Roberts states:—

I would have more respect for this evidence if, instead of being the alleged statements of these several parties, it had been the very statements themselves—the statements of Mr. Whitehead and of Emma Smith, instead of a report of what they said by some Josephite writer. So far as Mr. George J. Adams is concerned he must very soon have forgotten his ela-

tion at finding out who the true successor of the prophet was; for he afterwards became a follower of Mr. Strang, and the very man who crowned him "king" at Beaver Island.—Roberts, p. 56.

These statements were published during the lifetime and with the knowledge of James Whitehead and Emma Smith, and received their tacit approval by not being corrected by them. However, we will here present the following direct statement of Elder Whitehead, given under oath in the Temple Lot suit:—

I recollect a meeting that was held in the winter of 1843, at Nauvoo, Illinois, prior to Joseph Smith's death, at which the appointment was made by him, Joseph Smith, of his successor. His son Joseph was selected as his successor. Joseph Smith did the talking. There were present Joseph and Hyrum Smith, John Taylor, and some others who also spoke on the subject; there were twenty-five I suppose at the meeting. At that meeting Joseph Smith, the present presiding officer of the complainant church, was selected by his father as his successor. He was ordained and anointed at that meeting. Hyrum Smith, the Patriarch, anointed him, and Joseph his father blessed him and ordained him, and Newell K. Whitney poured the oil on his head, and he was set apart to be his father's successor in office, holding all the powers that his father held. I cannot tell all the persons that were present, there was a good many there. John Taylor and Willard Richards, they were two of the "Twelve," Ebenezer Robinson was present, and George J. Adams, Alpheus Cutler, and Reynolds Cahoon. I cannot tell them all; I was there too.—Plaintiff's Abstract, p. 28.

Shall we now have more respect from Mr. Roberts? George J. Adams may have lost confidence in this appointment afterward; we do not know. But he did not forget "his elation at finding out who the true successor of the prophet was" so readily as Mr. Roberts would have us believe; for, according to the letter of James Kay, from which we have quoted (see p. 18), he was with William Smith at St. Louis, in November, 1845, advocating the right of young Joseph to the presidency. Emma Smith and James Whitehead agree that G. J. Adams was present at this anointing. We present the fact that Mr. Adams

advocated the right of succession in young Joseph immediately after, as a strong corroborative circumstance.

In confirmation of the testimony of James Whitehead and in refutation of Mr. Roberts' statement that "Josephites quote *only* the testimony of Mr. James Whitehead," we cite the testimony of John H. Carter, of near Provo, Utah, taken in the Temple Lot suit, at Salt Lake, Utah, March 14, 1892. After relating that this took place when he was present, at a Sunday service held in the Bowery near the Temple, at Nauvoo, not long before Joseph was killed, he says:—

> Joseph Smith came on the stand leading his son, young Joseph, and they sat him down on a bench at the prophet's right hand, and Joseph got up and began to preach and talk to the people, and the question he said was asked by somebody, "If Joseph Smith should be killed or die, who would be his successor?" And he turned around and said, pointing to his son, "There is the successor," and he went on and said "My work is pretty nearly done," and that is about all he said in regard to his son. He said in answer to a question that was asked as to who should be his successor in case he should be killed or die, and he pointed to his son, young Joseph, who was sitting there at his side, and said he; "There is your leader."—Plaintiff's Abstract, pp. 180, 181.

Upon this point the testimony of Mr. Whitehead and Mr. Carter agrees; and they corroborate the statement of President Smith published in 1868. (See p. 40.) Is it stupidity or dishonesty that causes Mr. Roberts to flounder so?

Mr. Roberts seeks to throw discredit upon the testimony of Charles Derry, D. S. Mills, Lucy Smith (mother of the prophet), George Miller, Louis Gaulter, Harriet E. Gaulter, Arthur Milliken, and A. B. Moore; but as in neither case does he introduce evidence in rebuttal or to impeach, we shall not follow him in his immaterial struggle. The testimony of the witnesses must stand until it is proved false or they are impeached. These witnesses are known

by reputation, and some of them personally to many of our readers. They need no certificate of character.

We will however briefly notice the comment of Mr. Roberts on Bishop Miller's testimony. He says:—

> If Bishop Miller had any testimony of any weight that Mr. Smith, the son of the prophet, had been appointed to succeed to the position of prophet and President of the church, will those who rely on his statements explain how it is that with such testimony in his possession he ran off after other leaders? First following Mr. Lyman Wight to Texas, and after quarrelling with him joining Mr. Strang in Michigan. Bishop Miller, like Lyman Wight, lost his honor, he was neither true to the church of Christ led by the Twelve after the martyrdom of the prophet Joseph, nor true to Mr. Wight, nor "young Joseph." He became a restless man after his apostasy, unstable as water. There is nothing either in the nature of his testimony or the character of the man after his apostasy which gives any influence to his statement.—Roberts, p. 61.

To say that the above insinuations are mean and despicable is to put the case mildly. Not one word of testimony that he and Mr. Wight quarreled; that either of them lost their honor; that the church which he rejected was the Church of Christ; that he was untrue to Mr. Wight or young Joseph; that he became a restless man; that he apostatized; that he was unstable as water. All this is flaunted before us without proof with a recklessness that betrays that its author is conscious that his success depends on his blinding the eyes of the people to the real issue. In contrast with this, let us quote what the Lord said of George Miller in 1841:—

> Let no man despise my servant George, for he shall honor me.—D. C. 107: 8.

The issue then is between the Lord and Roberts. We let it rest there.

As for the explanation asked for by Mr. Roberts, Bishop Miller probably went to Lyman Wight because Lyman Wight taught lineal priesthood, and afterwards to J. J.

Strang because of the resolution passed by the Strangite conference in 1849. (See p. 39.)

Elder Roberts in his work page 66 quotes Brigham Young as stating (see *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 683) that Joseph Smith ordained his brother Hyrum to succeed him. This claim made in October, 1844, by Elder Brigham Young, would, if true, destroy the prophetic character of Joseph Smith; for, as Elder Young informs us, Hyrum fell a martyr before Joseph did; hence if he was so ordained, it was a failure, and certainly God did not prompt it. We cannot accept this upon the unsupported statement of Elder Young.

The words quoted by Mr. Roberts from Tullidge do not convey the idea that Joseph *ordained* Hyrum to be his successor.

Mr. Roberts presents another division of the subject in these words:—

> Having disposed of Mr. Smith's claim to the right of the Presidency of the church so far as it is based upon an appointment through his father, let us now take up his second claim, viz:
>
> *The position is his by lineage—his birth-right.*
>
> There are two offices and only two, in the church which descend by lineage from father to son: the office of patriarch and that of bishop.—Roberts, pp. 66, 67.

We do not object to the application of the law of lineage to the offices of Patriarch and Bishop. We believe, as a general rule, that what belongs to the father belongs to his posterity if competent, available, and worthy. Recognizing, however, that the son's right to his father's position is contingent upon these conditions, and that God alone is a competent judge of ability and worthiness, we hold that no man should be ordained to any office without a call from God. We believe, however, that, under favorable conditions, all other things being equal, God recognizes this principle in his selections. What we object to

in Mr. Roberts' theory is the limiting of the application of this law to the two offices he mentions. This we believe to be erroneous.

We have already shown that Joseph Smith, the Martyr, held the keys of the kingdom by virtue of his having received the blessings of his progenitors, and that this blessing was to descend to his posterity after him. We now proceed to show that this law has a general application.

A revelation was received through Joseph Smith the prophet on December 6, 1832, which is addressed to the Priesthood without distinction as follows:—

Verily thus saith the Lord unto you, my servants, etc.—D. C. 84: 1.

In this revelation is found the following paragraph:—

Therefore, thus saith the Lord unto you, with whom the priesthood hath continued through the lineage of your fathers, for ye are lawful heirs, according to the flesh, and have been hid from the world with Christ in God: therefore your life and the priesthood hath remained, and must needs remain, through you and your lineage, until the restoration of all things spoken by the mouths of all the holy prophets since the world began.—D. C. 84: 3.

Here the law of lineage is specifically and clearly taught as applied to those holding the priesthood, and it is expressly declared that those who held the priesthood in 1832 did so in harmony with the rights of lineage. It is natural for some men in the heat of argument to inadvertently strain a point for the sake of a specific application, and if overzealous individuals have made this mistake with this passage we decline to be bound by such argument. We concede, and believe, that this passage does not have an exclusive application to Joseph Smith and his posterity, but that it is general in its application. We contend, however, that while Joseph Smith and his posterity are not the only ones referred to, they should not be excluded from the application of this general rule.

It is asserted, however, that this language treats only of the priesthood, and not to offices in the priesthood. It would be difficult for Mr. Roberts and his fellows to establish his exception in the case of the Patriarch upon this reasoning. However, we have shown clearly that Joseph, the Martyr, held his *position* in the priesthood by virtue of his having obtained the blessings of his progenitors, and that that blessing was to descend to his posterity. We believe that other families are subject to the same rule, contingent upon the same conditions and restrictions. Science has proclaimed a reason for this provision, not considered in former years, which demonstrates its beauty and consistency. The theory of prenatal influences, which provides that the child before birth is influenced in disposition and traits of character by its parentage, is now adopted by the best minds of the age. It follows then that if a man is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of his calling, and earnestly and zealously engaged in the execution of the duties of that office, the child born to him under these conditions is likely to possess pre-eminently the qualities neccessary to succeed in the position filled by the father; more especially is this true when the mother is also thoroughly in sympathy with the father's work; hence the wisdom of removing the family from their place when the father fails to occupy properly, as declared in the following warning:—

> And now verily I say unto Joseph Smith, Jr., you have not kept the commandments, and must needs stand rebuked before the Lord. Your family must needs repent and forsake some things, and give more earnest heed unto your sayings, or be removed out of their place. What I say unto one I say unto all: Pray always, lest that wicked one have power in you, and remove you out of your place.
>
> My servant Newel K. Whitney, also a bishop of my church, hath need to be chastened, and set in order his family, and see that they are more diligent and concerned at home, and pray always, or they shall be removed out of their place.—D. C. 90: 8, 9.

According to this, not only the Smith family and the Whitney family had a *place* in the church, but *all* were in the same condition, their *place* depending upon their *faithfulness.*

The effect of prenatal influences will naturally be more marked and positive where the parent's work is of an inspired spiritual character, than where it is merely of a physical or unaided mental character.

It is conceded that God can use any man, who is willing, for the accomplishment of his purposes; but we urge that in providing a law or rule of succession he would evidently choose that law or rule most likely to produce the best results.

For some cause the church in Utah has found it advisable to practically follow this rule in many of the leading offices in their organization. As a result they have in the Presidency, Joseph F. Smith to succeed his father, Hyrum; as presiding Patriarch, John Smith, to succeed his father; in the Quorum of the Twelve, Brigham, the son of Brigham Young; John Henry, the son of George A. Smith; Heber J., the son of Jedediah Grant; Francis M., the son of Amasa Lyman; John W., the son of John Taylor; and A. O. Woodruff, son of Wilford Woodruff. The late Abram Cannon, of the same quorum, was, we believe, the son of George Q. Cannon. What then but the ambition of Brigham Young and his successors, real and prospective, has prompted this people to contend so strenuously against the application of the law of lineage to the Presidency of the church?

Mr. Roberts concludes his argument under this head as follows:—

As a conclusion to my argument against the claim of Mr. Smith, that the position of President of the church is his by right of lineage, I quote the words of his illustrious father. In a discourse delivered on the 27th of August, 1843, having for his text the seventh chapter of Hebrews, and explaining the

phrase in the third verse—"without father, without mother, *without descent*," etc., he said:

The Melchisedek priesthood holds the right from the eternal God, *and not by descent from father and mother;* and that priesthood is eternal as God himself, having neither beginning of days nor end of life.

In the face of this how can Mr. Smith claim any right, by virtue of lineage, to the Melchisedek priesthood, much less to the highest office in that priesthood? His claim is denied by that very father from whom he claims to have received it by inheritance. It occurs to me here to ask a question: If the office of President of the church does descend by lineage from the fathers, through the line of the eldest sons, how is it that the "law" did not operate on the other side of the prophet Joseph as well as on this side of him? If that "law" had operated so—and there is no good reason why it should not so operate, if indeed it be the "law" of the priesthood—it would have left out not only the present Mr. Smith but even the prophet Joseph himself. For in that event it would have come first to Joseph Smith, the father of the prophet, who was a noble, righteous man; and then after his death to his eldest living son, Hyrum Smith, than whom there has been no more righteous man among all the sons of God who have lived in this generation; and from him it would have passed on to his eldest son, thus leaving out the prophet Joseph altogether, as well as Mr. Smith.—Roberts, pp. 71, 72.

For this purported quotation from Joseph Smith, upon which Mr. Roberts bases his argument, he cites us to the History of Joseph Smith, *Millennial Star*, Vol. 22, p. 55. This was published about the year 1860, twenty-six years after the death of Joseph Smith, and when we consider that the genuineness of some publications issued by the Utah Church in those times is doubted, we can attach but little importance to such testimony. As an instance of this unreliability we cite the resolution of August 8, 1844, as quoted by Mr. Roberts from *Millennial Star*, Vol. 25, compared with the resolution published in the *Times and Seasons*. (See p. 13.)

Besides this Mr. Roberts places a strained construction on the words of Joseph Smith as quoted. Without lengthy comment we simply submit that the views of Joseph Smith

on this passage were doubtless in harmony with the rendering by himself found in the Inspired Translation, as follows:—

> For this Melchisedec was ordained a priest after the order of the Son of God, which order was without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life. And all those who are ordained unto this priesthood are made like unto the Son of God, abiding a priest continually.—Hebrews 7:3.

This makes the *order of the priesthood* without father, or mother, or descent, and has no reference to rights of succession to offices in that order. So if Joseph Smith did use the language attributed to him by Mr. Roberts, he evidently intended to take the position that the *order originated* with God, and not by descent, etc. Any other construction would place him in opposition to his own rendering of the passage.

As for the question which it occurred to Mr. Roberts to ask, all we have to say is this: We have explained and maintained that, though God honors the principle of lineal descent both in priesthood and presidency, yet as God is the sole judge of fitness and availability, none should be elevated to office except by revelation from God. Just why the Lord did not restore this family to the position to which they were entitled because of the blessings of their progenitors a generation or more sooner than he did, is not to our knowledge revealed. The same is true regarding the Lord's reason for passing by Hyrum Smith. It is, however, idle to discuss these questions, for Mr. Roberts and his indorsers concede that the Lord did choose *Joseph* Smith; and the issue is: What provision did the Lord make for succession after him?

That Joseph understood that his posterity was to succeed him in his work is evident from the following extract from a letter written to John C. Calhoun, January 2, 1844:—

While I have powers of body and mind; while water runs and grass grows, while virtue is lovely and vice hateful; and while a stone points out a sacred spot where a fragment of American liberty once was; I or my posterity will plead the cause of injured innocence, until Missouri makes atonement for all her sins—or sinks disgraced, degraded and damned to hell—'where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.'—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 395.

Mr. Roberts proceeds as follows:—

The third claim made in behalf of Mr. Smith is:

He was called to the position of President of the church by "revelation" to himself.

Of this it is not necessary to say very much. It could only be important if sustained by the other two claims, viz: that he was appointed by his father to succeed to the office of President of the church; and secondly, that the office is his by lineage. Since these two claims have been disproven, it renders his third claim of no effect.—Roberts, pp. 72, 73.

Certainly Mr. Roberts is getting reckless! Does he intend to concede that an appointment from Joseph the Seer and the claim of lineage are of such vital importance that where they are wanting a revelation would be insufficient? It seems incredible that Mr. Roberts would give his case away by such a concession; *yet this is just what he says:* The claim that he was called by revelation "*could only be important if sustained by the other two.*"

Mr. Roberts concedes more than we claim. We hold that if he had never been appointed by his father, and if there had been no such doctrine announced as lineal priesthood, a call from God by revelation would have been important. The first prophet and President of the church was called by revelation through himself, and that too when the doctrine of lineal descent was unknown, and when he had no immediate predecessor to appoint him, as the following will show:—

Behold, there shall be a record kept among you, and in it thou shalt be called a seer, a translator, a prophet, an apostle of Jesus Christ, an elder of the church through the will of God the Father, and the grace of your Lord Jesus Christ; being inspired of the Holy Ghost to lay the foundation thereof, and

to build it up unto the most holy faith; which church was organized and established, in the year of your Lord eighteen hundred and thirty, in the fourth month, and on the sixth day of the month, which is called April.—D. C. 19: 1.

However, we may have misunderstood Mr. Roberts. He may mean that unless Mr. Smith was appointed by his father, or that it was his right by lineage, his claim to be a revelator would not be valid, and hence his revelations would be of "no effect." If he concedes so much, we thank him. We shall have need for this concession when considering the claims of Brigham Young.

He then refers to the manifestations received by President Smith, and adds:—

These are all the "revelations" spoken of by Mr. Smith in his autobiography, or quoted by his supporters, hence these must be the "revelations" to himself by which he was called to be President of the church! Just where the "call" can be found in them is the thing which the writer of these pages cannot see: and he challenges anybody else to point it out.—Roberts, p. 74.

We accept this challenge and in evidence produce a revelation to President Smith quoted by Mr. Roberts from Joseph Smith's autobiography as follows:—

The Saints reorganizing at Zarahemla and other places, is the only organized portion of the Church accepted by me. I have given them my spirit, and will continue to do so while they remain humble and faithful.—Roberts, pp. 73, 74.

Here is a definite and specific acknowledgement of the Reorganization forming at Zarahemla and elsewhere. Now it only remains to show what was the position on this point of the people thus strongly indorsed, and Mr. Roberts' challenge is met. It will be remembered that this manifestation to President Smith came in 1859.

Elder Jason Briggs claimed that as early as November 18, 1851, he received a revelation containing this statement:—

In mine own due time will I call upon the seed of Joseph Smith, and will bring one forth, and he shall be mighty and

strong, and he shall preside over the high priesthood of my church, etc.—*The Messenger*, Vol. 2, p. 1.

Elder Z. H. Gurley, Sen., claims that in 1852 a manifestation came to him as follows:—

The successor of Joseph Smith is Joseph Smith, the son of Joseph Smith, the prophet; it is his right by lineage, saith the Lord your God.—Ibid., p. 9.

Upon this and like information these men and others proceeded to renounce all other leaders and to teach that the right of presidency was vested in Joseph Smith, the son of the prophet. If Mr. Roberts cannot see that the indorsement of the Reorganization received by President Smith in 1859 carried with it the position occupied by the Reorganization on the subject of Presidency, the reader can.

Again, the indorsement of this position was not confined to these two men, for in June, 1852, the body adopted, among other resolutions, the following:—

Resolved, that the successor of Joseph Smith, Junior, as the Presiding High Priest in the Melchisedec priesthood, must of necessity be of the seed of Joseph Smith, Junior, in fulfillment of the law and promises of God.—*The Messenger*, Vol. 2, p. 9.

Mr. Roberts' next statement is as follows:—

It should be observed here, perhaps, that "revelations" to a man personally, that he is called to be President of the church, even when clear and definite, do not constitute him the President. Something else is necessary. As observed elsewhere, not only must a man be called of God, but he must be accepted by the church—"chosen by the body, appointed and ordained to that office, and upheld by the confidence, faith, and prayer of the church."—Roberts, p. 74.

To this we agree, and shall insist in all our controversy that we cannot accept as President of the church any man not filling these requirements. Of course, Mr. Roberts denies in this connection that President Smith was accepted and chosen by the true church; and that he was appointed and ordained by proper authority. But his denial is scarcely worth the space required to notice it.

However, is it consistent for Mr. Roberts to insist upon these requirements in the case of Mr. Smith while he defends the claims of Messrs. Young, Taylor, Woodruff, and Snow to the Presidency, none of whom was ever ordained by anyone to the office of President of the church? Or, if they were, we have seen no record of it; nor have we been able to get any information on this point from the authorities of the Utah Church. Some time ago we made an effort to obtain data upon this and other points, but the result was very unsatisfactory.

That the reader may know just what our effort was, and how treated, we here give the correspondence.

The following letter which explains its own purpose, was addressed to Elder F. D. Richards, their Church Recorder and Historian:—

LAMONI, Iowa, October 2, 1896.

F. D. RICHARDS,

Dear Sir:—I believe you are Church Recorder, and so write you for historical information. Will you favor me by stating what the approximate or exact numerical strength of the church was at the time of the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith.

I desire this simply to get at correct historical data.

Respectfully,

HEMAN C. SMITH.

To this we received the following reply:—

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah, Oct. 12, 1896.

MR. HEMAN C. SMITH, Lamoni, Iowa.

Dear Sir:—In reply to yours of the 2d inst. as to the numerical strength of the church at the time of the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith.

The nearest we can approximate the number was about 26,000 to 27,000 souls. Respectfully,

F. D. RICHARDS.

To this we replied as follows:—

LAMONI, Iowa, Oct. 17, 1896.

F. D. RICHARDS,

Dear Sir:—Yours of October 12, 1896, is at hand, stating the approximate numerical strength of the church at the death of

Joseph and Hyrum Smith to have been "about 26,000 to 27,000 souls."

I am surprised at the number being given so small by you. How do you explain the statements of Joseph Smith on this point? In a historical sketch written by him and published by I. Daniel Rupp in 1844 he writes: "There are no correct data by which the exact number of members composing this now extensive, and still extending, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints can be known. Should it be supposed at 150,000 it might still be short of the truth."—History of Religious Denominations, p. 409.

In his reply to Henry Clay, May 13, 1844, he writes: "Why, Great God! to transport 200,000 people through a vast prairie; over the Rocky Mountains, to Oregon, a distance of nearly two thousand miles, would cost more than *four millions!*"—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 547.

These two statements would closely agree if we include in the latter statement dependents who were not members, but there is a very wide difference between your estimate and his.

I do not quote these statements by way of argument against your figures, but to get your explanation of the difference. Upon what basis did you make your estimate? Have you the record of names kept at the time? I want to get at the truth of the matter for the sake of historical accuracy.

I would like to ask another favor of you; namely: to inform me *when*, *where*, and by *whom* were Brigham Young, John Taylor, and Wilford Woodruff ordained Presidents of the High Priesthood, or Presidents of the church, if so ordained?

Or if it is the position of your people that they needed no other ordination than that to the Apostleship, will you please so state.

I am engaged in writing history and do not wish to misrepresent you. Respectfully,

HEMAN C. SMITH.

Awaiting until November 19, and receiving no reply to our inquiries, we wrote Mr. Richards as follows:—

LAMONI, Iowa, Nov. 19, 1896.

F. D. RICHARDS,

Dear Sir:—On October 17, I wrote you in reply to yours of October 12. I am very anxious to receive answer to inquiries made. If you have not received it please let me know and I will send you a copy.

I am, respectfully,

HEMAN C. SMITH.

Still receiving no reply, we awaited until December 16,

when we mailed him a copy of our letter of October 17, together with the following note, registering them:—

LAMONI, Iowa, Dec. 16, 1896.

F. D. RICHARDS,

Dear Sir:—On October 17 I wrote you in answer to yours of October 12, and made some further inquiries. Waiting until November 19, and receiving no reply I wrote inquiring if you received it. Still I have no reply.

I now inclose a copy of my letter of October 17, as you may not have received the original. Will you please give it your early attention, as I am anxious to get the information sought.

I inclose stamp for reply.

In bonds,

HEMAN C. SMITH.

In due course of mail we received the "Registry Return Receipt," signed "F. D. Richards, per John Jaques;" but up to date, November 15, 1898, no answer has been received.

When two of their own representatives, J. H. Stout and U. G. Miller, made the same inquiry they were just as unsuccessful, as the following will show:—

"'Will you please answer the following through the *News:* Who ordained President Brigham Young to the office of President of the Church, and also the date of the organization? The Reorganized ministers are making the statement that he never was ordained, and that the people never made the claim that he was. No doubt it will be of use to others of the elders as well as ourselves.'

"For the information of those who send the inquiry, we will state that the event referred to is carefully recorded in church history, and has been published frequently. President Brigham Young was installed as the President of the Church, in the quorum of the First Presidency, by the Council of the Apostles, on December 5, 1847. Not a ceremony necessary to the performance of that solemn duty was omitted—everything was done in perfect order, and by the united voice of the Twelve. President Young had been President of the Church in his position as President of the presiding quorum, the Twelve Apostles, for more than three years previous to the date given, or ever since the martyrdom of the Prophet Joseph. When, on the date mentioned, President Young had been duly installed as the chief in the First Presidency, he selected Heber C. Kimball and Willard Richards as first and second counselors respectively, and they were also

duly set apart, being sustained by the unanimous vote of the Twelve. In their case, as with President Young, no ceremony was omitted."—Daily *Deseret News*, October 5, 1896.

Comment is useless; but we still insist upon answers to these inquiries, and until they are received we shall maintain that the gentlemen named, to whom we now add the name of Mr. Snow, were not at any time ordained to the office of President of the church; and hence according to Mr. Roberts' position stated above, were not properly constituted Presidents of the church.

Again, Brigham Young admits by the strongest kind of inference that he was not ordained to the office of President of the church. He says:—

Who ordained me to be First President of this Church on earth? I answer, it is the choice of this people, and that is sufficient.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 16, p. 442.

But Mr. Roberts says it is not sufficient, but that he should be *ordained*. In this Mr. Roberts is right; but how can he sustain Mr. Young who is wrong?

With President Smith the case was different. He was ordained by what he considered proper authority; a record of that ordination has been made and published, and is open for investigation. We are prepared to defend the authority by which the ordination was performed, when legitimately questioned, but in this connection we pass it by for the reason that Mr. Roberts' objection to the apostolic authority exercised upon that occasion is based upon his own affirmation. Hear him:—

Now, I affirm that among all those seven men who were "called" to form the majority of the quorum of the twelve, in the "Reorganization" not one of them held the apostleship; that they could not give what they did not possesss; that therefore neither the seven men called to be apostles, in April, 1853, received the apostleship, nor any whom they subsequently ordained.—Roberts, p. 77.

The only answer that this deserves is a counter affirma-

tion; but we may consider the question of authority more fully in another part of our investigation.

Mr. Roberts makes a labored effort to show that whatever authority may have been possessed by Zenos H. Gurley and William Marks prior to the death of Joseph Smith, they lost by indorsing the claims of J. J. Strang and others. But this is only an assumption. We have the same right to assume that all who followed Brigham Young thereby lost their authority.

Proceeding upon the basis of his affirmation that those claiming apostolic authority in the Reorganization did not possess it, Mr. Roberts seeks to show a contrast between this organization and the one effected in 1830 by endeavoring to show that Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery, and others acted in the last-named organization by virtue of apostolic authority. Any position, no matter how sound, could apparently be overthrown if the objector is allowed his own affirmation as a basis from which to argue; but it takes a great amount of assurance and impudence for a man to offer his own assertion as basic evidence.

The next thing in Mr. Roberts' argument which we deem necessary to notice in this connection is the following:—

> Josephites lay much stress upon the following passage in one of the revelations:
>
> I say unto you that ye have received a commandment for a law unto my church through him whom I have appointed unto you to receive commandments and revelations from my hand. And this ye shall know assuredly, that there is none other appointed unto you to receive commandments and revelations until he be taken, if he abide in me. But verily, verily, I say unto you, that none else shall be appointed unto this gift except it be through him, for if it be taken from him, he shall not have power, except to appoint another in his stead; and this shall be a law unto you, that ye receive not the teachings of any that shall come before you as revelations and commandments; and this I give unto you that you may not be deceived, that you may know that they are not of me. For verily I say unto you, that he that is ordained of me, shall come in at the gate and be ordained, as I have told you before, to teach those

revelations which you have received, and shall receive through him whom I have appointed.

Josephites insist that this revelation provides that the successor of the prophet Joseph must be appointed by him.—Roberts, pp. 82, 83.

This is quite a fair statement for Mr. Roberts to make, yet a more careful man would have stated our position more accurately by saying, that we insist that this revelation recognizes the authority of the prophet Joseph to appoint his successor, and that if he did so appoint, the appointment is valid.

After relating some of the circumstances under which the above revelation was given, none of which would in anywise change the import of the language, or modify its meaning, Mr. Roberts proceeds to give his understanding of this passage, in the following language:—

The information thus given officially to the church was calculated to preserve the saints from following unauthorized "law-givers." Through it they learned that Joseph, if he remained faithful, would be the law-giver to Israel; if he transgressed he should retain sufficient of the power of revelation to designate whom the Lord would have to succeed him; and in that or any other event the man who becomes President must come in at the gate and be ordained as described in one of the laws of the church previously given. There was surely no need after this that any should be deceived. But to argue from what is set down in this revelation that the only possible way for a successor "in any event," to be appointed to the church was through Joseph Smith the prophet, is clearly an error; for the only provision made in this revelation for him to appoint his successor is in the event of his own transgression; and I affirm that Joseph Smith was faithful to God and the church up to the day of his death.—Roberts, p. 84.

We cannot avoid being amused at Mr. Roberts' propensity for settling a question with his characteristic "*I affirm.*" It reminds us of a comment made by one of his church associates, but political opponents, to the effect that Mr. Roberts never appeared before the public without saying by his manner, "*I am B. H. Roberts.*" However, our chief objection is to the following:—

The only provision made in this revelation for him to appoint his successor is in the event of his own transgression.

We do not so comprehend the language. The words, "Verily, verily I say unto you, that none else shall be appointed unto this gift except it be through him," admit of no modifications or exceptions. The words following: "for if it be taken from him he shall not have power, except to appoint another in his stead," etc., simply convey the impression that this right, vested in him by virtue of his office, he would retain, even in case of transgression, to avoid confusion and uncertainty. To take the position, as Mr. Roberts does, that Joseph Smith was not authorized to appoint his successor except in the event of his transgression, is to make the authority to appoint contingent upon transgression.

We can readily see the possibility and even advisability, for this specific purpose, of a man retaining a part of his authority, already bestowed, after transgression; but the idea that God would bestow authority not before held, upon a transgressor, which would be denied him if faithful, is absurd. We have long been taught that God bestows authority, honor, and power as a reward for faithfulness; but it remained for this illustrious guardian of the "order of the priesthood of God, and the facts of church history," to inform us that God reserves certain authority for the transgressor alone.

What to us seems very peculiar is that notwithstanding Mr. Roberts' claim that Joseph Smith had no authority to appoint his successor except in the event of his transgression, and notwithstanding he affirms that Joseph did prove faithful, yet he asserts, on the authority of Brigham Young, that Joseph did appoint his brother Hyrum to succeed him. (See Roberts' book, page 66.)

Certainly God would provide for succession and the per-

petuity of his work in case of Joseph's death, as much so as in case of his transgression.

We are impressed to close this chapter with these words of Mr. Roberts, which we commend:—

> Can it be that God, with whom all things are as present, had not foreseen this fate which overtook his servants Joseph and Hyrum, and failed to provide for such an emergency? O, charge not the Lord with such lack of wisdom, or his church with such imperfection in its organization!—Roberts, p. 85.

CHAPTER 7.

ROBERTS' DISCREPANCIES—TWELVE SECOND IN AUTHORITY—TEMPLE NOT COMPLETED — CHURCH REJECTED — PRATT'S REVELATION.

THOUGH what was done in the case of Sidney Rigdon at Nauvoo is not of special importance to this discussion, we wish briefly to note the discrepancy in Mr. Roberts' own account, and also his clash with his own witnesses. On page 88 of his book Mr. Roberts states of Mr. Rigdon:—

> He sought to be appointed Guardian of the church, but was unanimously rejected by the assembled quorums of priesthood and the saints at Nauvoo.

This agrees with the statement of Elder Woodruff (see p. 13), but unfortunately it conflicts with Mr. Roberts' own statement that no vote was taken on Rigdon's claims. (See p. 12.) This is Roberts *versus* Roberts. At one time he agrees with the record as published in *Times and Seasons* (see p. 12), and at the other time with Wilford Woodruff. It will not do; no man can agree with the record and with Woodruff too.

In regard to the vote on the sustaining of the Twelve, he is in just as bad as a muddle. He states that the vote was *unanimous* (see p. 12), and quotes the *Millennial Star* to the same effect (see pp. 13, 14); but he had previously quoted from the journal of William C. Staines, that the "vote was taken to sustain the Twelve in their office, which *with a few dissenting voices*, was passed. (See p. 10.)

Do not forget, reader, that this man Roberts is a zealous defender of the "*facts* of church history."

Mr. Roberts enters into a long dissertation to show that

the Twelve were next in authority after the First Presidency, and hence should preside in their absence, and that the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith did not disorganize the church. We agree that the Twelve are next in authority to the First Presidency. We have no objection to their presiding at any proper *time* and *place*, providing they do so in their own office and calling. We object not to their *doing*, but to their manner of doing, and to what they did, as will appear before the close of this investigation. Nor do we claim that the church was disorganized by the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith. The church, we claim, was rejected because of its own acts of transgression, and its failure to comply with the commands of God.

But Mr. Roberts in speaking of the church asserts:—

> There is nothing in all that God has revealed to indicate that he ever contemplated its disorganization; but on the contrary, there is every encouragement to believe that it will go on from grace to grace, from faith to faith, from one victory to another until, like the little stone of Daniel's vision, it shall become a great mountain and fill the whole earth.—Roberts, p. 89.

Mr. Roberts may possibly make some play upon the word "contemplated," but the careful reader cannot fail to see that God warned the saints that there was danger of the church being *rejected* by him if they did not perform the work appointed. In a revelation given January 19, 1841, this warning was given in specific and plain language, as follows:—

> And again, verily I say unto you, Let all my saints come from afar; and send ye swift messengers, yea, chosen messengers, and say unto them, Come ye, with all your gold, and your silver, and your precious stones, and with all your antiquities; and with all who have knowledge of antiquities, that will come may come, and bring the box tree, and the fir tree, and the pine tree, together with all the precious trees of the earth; and with iron, with copper, and with brass, and with zinc, and with all your precious things of the earth, and build a house to my name, for the Most High to dwell therein;

for there is not a place found on earth that he may come and restore again that which was lost unto you, or, which he hath taken away, even the fullness of the priesthood; for a baptismal font there is not upon the earth; that they, my saints, may be baptized for those who are dead; for this ordinance belongeth to my house, and cannot be acceptable to me, only in the days of your poverty, wherein ye are not able to build a house unto me. But I command you, all ye my saints, to build a house unto me; and I grant unto you a sufficient time to build a house unto me, and during this time your baptisms shall be acceptable unto me.

But, behold, at the end of this appointment, your baptisms for your dead shall not be acceptable unto me; and if you do not these things at the end of the appointment, ye shall be rejected as a church with your dead, saith the Lord your God. —D. C. 107: 10, 11.

There was then a possibility of the church being rejected, and the conditions under which it would be rejected are plainly set forth. None can misunderstand this. It forcibly teaches that a sufficient time would be granted to build a temple at Nauvoo, and that if it was not built at the end of that time the church would be rejected. The pertinent inquiry then is, Was the temple built?

On page 102 Mr. Roberts says:—

The Temple was completed.

But Mr. Penrose admits that it was not completed, and argues that a completion was not necessary. He says:—

Now it is a matter of history that notwithstanding the opposition of the enemies of the Church, the murder of the Prophet and Patriarch, the threatenings and plots and ragings of mobocrats, and the scantiness of means for the great work before them, the Saints went to with their might and built that house according to the commandment of the Lord and the pattern revealed to Joseph Smith, which with all the keys and authority and power of the Holy Priesthood he had given to the Twelve, and that it was so far completed before the exodus from that city that it was dedicated to the Lord, and baptisms for the dead were performed in the sacred font, and washings, anointings, endowments and other ordinances were solemnized therein, both for the living and for the dead.

But, it is objected by the "Reorganizers" that the Temple was not fully "completed," and Brigham Young is quoted as saying after his arrival in Utah, that the Saints would attempt

to build a Temple, and that "This has been attempted several times, but we have never yet had the privilege of completing and enjoying one." Our very technical and disputatious opponents are never tired of repeating in this connection the words "complete" and "completed." But a careful examination of the word of the Lord fails to discover those words or anything equivalent to them. The Lord told his people to build a house to him; they did build and use it for the purposes he designed. They were not permitted to remain and enjoy it. There were, probably, some additions which would have been made to "complete" the edifice in the full sense of the term, if the builders had remained to enjoy it. . . .

It is surprising that sane people, however biased and prejudiced, could entertain the notion that the just and merciful Father and the tender and loving Christ would reject the people who had toiled so faithfully to obey the commandment given them to build a Temple, because, before they could perfectly finish the structure after building it, in consequence of the inroad made upon them by their enemies they were compelled to forsake all their possessions for the Gospel's sake!—Penrose, pp. 6, 7, 8.

The evidence shows that Mr. Penrose is right, and Mr. Roberts wrong, so far as the facts are concerned regarding the completion of the temple.

On June 26, 1897, President Joseph Smith made a statement on this subject from which we quote the following:—

I knew of the work being done on the temple at that place from the time it began until the building was burned in 1848 It was not finished. The basement was fitted for occupation, and the baptismal font was ready for use. The auditorium on the first floor was completed sufficiently to be seated and occupied for assembly purposes. The stairway on the south side was completed for use. The auditorium on second floor, the stairway on north side, nor any other portion of the building except those above-named were completed; though the small rooms above the second floor auditorium were used by President Young and the resident church authorities for various purposes.—Church History, Vol. 2, p. 563.

Patriarch A. H. Smith also made a statement on July 2, 1897, a part of which is as follows:—

"The offices in the corner to the left of main entrance on the ground floor were finished, but not furnished. The auditorium or main meeting room was temporarily finished; the seats and pulpit were only temporary.

"The upper auditorium; the plastering was not done, the floor was only the rough boards, intended only for the lining, was laid, and from this floor upward the stairs, except in the tower, or circular main stairs, were also temporary; the upper floor which was to have been divided into numerous rooms was laid, and partitioned off with cotton factory cloth, and used for some purposes before the saints were driven away. . . .

"To my knowledge the temple never was finished, and those who have been led to believe it was, have been deceived. I make this statement freely for the benefit of the present and future generations."—Church History, Vol. 2, pp. 564, 565.

Elder Brigham Young is reported to have used the following language in St. George Temple, January 1, 1877:—

Joseph located the site for the Temple Block in Jackson County, Missouri, and pointed out the southeast corner of the temple in the year 1831; also laid the corner stone for a temple in Far West, Caldwell County, Missouri. These temples were not built. We built one in Nauvoo. I could pick out several before me now that were there when it was built, and know just how much was finished and what was done. It is true we left brethren there with instructions to finish it, and they got it nearly completed before it was burned; but the saints did not enjoy it. Now we have a temple which will all be finished in a few days, and of which there is enough completed to commence work therein, which has not been done since the days of Adam, that we have any knowledge of.—*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 18, p. 304.

These testimonies are sufficient to show that Mr. Roberts was in error about the temple at Nauvoo being completed. According to the first two statements it lacked very much of being complete; and though Mr. Young is not definite as to just what was done, he expresses the thought as late as January, 1877, that from the days of Adam until then there had not been a temple sufficiently finished to commence work in.

However, Mr. Penrose raises the point that the word "complete" or its equivalent is not found in the revelation, and argues that if they *built* the house they had complied with the requirements whether they *finished* it or not. We give Mr. Penrose credit for having discovered this ingenious method of defense. It certainly was never thought of

in early times, by the people to whom the revelation was given.

The leading men of the church understood it otherwise and were somewhat exercised over the urgent need of *completing* the temple *speedily.* In December, 1841, not quite a year after the date of this revelation, an epistle was published signed by Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Orson Pratt, William Smith, Lyman Wight, Wilford Woodruff, John Taylor, George A. Smith, and Willard Richards, which begins with these words:—

> The building of the Temple of the Lord, in the city of Nauvoo, is occupying the first place in the exertions and prayers of many of the saints at the present time, knowing as they do, that, if this building is not completed, speedily, *"we shall be rejected as a church with our dead,"* for the Lord our God hath spoken it.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 3, p 625.

On October 1, 1842, when Joseph Smith was editor, the *Times and Seasons* published an editorial under the caption of "*The Temple*" which commences with these words:—

> If there is any subject in which the saints of the Most High are interested more than another, it is in the *completion* of that edifice, etc.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 3, p. 937.

In the same article occurs the following:—

> The word of the Lord is build my house, and until that command is fulfilled we stand responsible to the great Jehovah for the fulfillment of it, and if not done in due time we may have to share the same fate that we have heretofore done in Missouri. —*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 3, p. 939.

These statements serve to show how this revelation was understood by Joseph Smith and the Twelve. We present them as clear and reliable proof that,

1. The idea of church rejection did not originate with the Reorganization.

2. The authorities of the church at the time were conscious that they were required to *complete* the temple, and understood the dread consequences of a failure.

The temple not being *completed*, the church stood *rejected*,

and neither the false statement of Mr. Roberts nor the specious pleading of Mr. Penrose will avail to cover this serious result from the research of the honest investigator.

Mr. Penrose, however, falls back upon that part of the revelation of 1841 which says:—

> Verily, verily I say unto you, that when I give a commandment to any of the sons of men, to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might, and with all they have, to perform that work, and cease not their diligence, and their enemies come upon them, and hinder them performing that work; behold, it behooveth me to require that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offerings; and the iniquity and transgression of my holy laws and commandments, I will visit upon the heads of those who hindered my work, unto the third and fourth generation, so long as they repent not, and hate me, saith the Lord God. Therefore, for this cause have I accepted the offerings of those whom I commanded to build up a city and a house unto my name, in Jackson County, Missouri, and were hindered by their enemies, saith the Lord your God; and I will answer judgment, wrath and indignation, wailing and anguish, and gnashing of teeth, upon their heads, unto the third and fourth generation, so long as they repent not, and hate me, saith the Lord your God.—D. C. 107: 15.

This, it will be seen, has a special application to the work which was to have been done in Jackson County, Missouri. It may also have a general application, and we believe it does; but it will be observed that a release from obligations is based upon their going "with *all their might*" and *ceasing not "their diligence."* That the saints at Nauvoo failed to do this may not generally be known; but that they cannot avail themselves of the provision made, for release from obligations enjoined, is evident from the following words in the revelation itself:—

> *I grant unto you a sufficient time to build a house unto me.*

If the Lord, according to this promise, did grant unto them *sufficient* time, and they failed to accomplish the work within that time, then it is evident that they did not use due diligence, and hence must accept the consequences

of *rejection*, and of the same fate they shared in Missouri. This latter consequence is too terribly true to be denied, and happy is he who will accept the first-named consequence and take proper steps to restore himself to the favor of God.

William Smith and Lyman Wight, two of the signers of the above letter, recognized the consequences; viz., of disorganization, which they, in 1841, were apprehensive of. As proof in the case of William Smith we cite the letter of James Kay, written in November, 1845. (See p. 18.)

In 1851, Lyman Wight wrote:—

"The church mostly went from there [Kirtland, Ohio] to Missouri, where they commenced another house from which they were driven to the State of Illinois, where we were commanded to build a house or temple to the Most High God. We were to have a sufficient time to build that house, during which time our baptisms for our dead should be acceptable in the river. If we did not build within this time we were to be rejected as a church, we and our dead together. Both the temple and baptizing went very leisurely, till the temple was somewhere in building the second story, when Bro. Joseph from the stand announced the alarming declaration that baptism for our dead was no longer acceptable in the river. As much to say the time for building the temple had passed by, and both we and our dead were rejected together. . . .

"The church now stands rejected together with their dead. The church being rejected now stands alienated from her God in every sense of the word."—Church History, Vol. 2, p. 790.

What but blind ambition to rule prevented others of the signers from recognizing the consequence so apparent?

Again, Parley P. Pratt, though not one of the signers, recognized that the church had been disorganized and that a *re*organization was necessary. Elder Pratt relates that as he was returning to Nauvoo after the death of Joseph and Hyrum, while "weighed down as it were unto death," he cried unto the Lord for direction, asking these two questions:—

Shall I tell them to fly to the wilderness and deserts? Or, shall I tell them to stay at home and take care of themselves, and continue to build the temple?

The answer was as follows:—

"Lift up your head and rejoice; for behold! it is well with my servants Joseph and Hyrum. My servant Joseph still holds the keys of my kingdom in this dispensation, and he shall stand in due time on the earth, in the flesh, and fulfill that to which he is appointed. Go and say unto my people in Nauvoo, that they shall continue to pursue their daily duties and take care of themselves, and make no movement in church government to reorganize or alter anything until the return of the remainder of the quorum of the Twelve. But exhort them that they continue to build the House of the Lord which I have commanded them to build in Nauvoo."—Autobiography of Parley P. Pratt, p. 371.

This recognizes the necessity of a *reorganization*, which carries with it the recognition of a *disorganization.*

We regret to notice that Mr. Roberts in quoting the above revelation omits the prefix "*re*" and makes it to read "*organize.*" (See his book, p. 94.)

It will be observed that Elder Pratt claims this to be from God. If so, God recognized the necessity of a Reorganization. Further, the answer to the above questions is clear that the people were to remain in Nauvoo and continue to build the temple, instead of flying to the "wilderness and deserts."

It is not necessary in this connection to discuss whether the Twelve had authority to go into Nauvoo and regulate or not. We agree that their mission was in all the world and that no part of the world was exempt from their jurisdiction; but there was no part of the world where they might become a law unto themselves. Wherever they might be they were required to act in harmony with the law of God and in accordance with the duty of their calling, or their acts would not be valid. The issue between us depends upon *what they did*, not upon *where they did it.*

CHAPTER 8.

KEYS OF AUTHORITY—KEYS AND ORACLES—PRATT'S REVELATION — ORACLES TO THE TWELVE — WILLIAM MARKS — ROBERTS' CLIMAX.

MR. ROBERTS opens his eighth chapter as follows:—

LET us now proceed to the proof that Joseph Smith, the prophet, did not take the keys of authority with him from the church, when he fell a martyr to the truth, but that said keys of authority remained with the church, more especially with the quorum of the Twelve.

On March 8th, 1833, the Lord said to Joseph Smith:

Verily, I say unto you, the keys of this kingdom shall never be taken from you, while thou art in the world, neither in the world to come; nevertheless, through you shall the oracles be given unto another; *yea, even to the church!*

Joseph and Hyrum, then, did not take with them the "oracles" of God necessary to make the church efficient in accomplishing the work that God designed it to perform. Though the keys given to the prophet were never to be taken from him, either in this world or that which is to come—though for ever he is to stand as the President of the great dispensation of the fullness of times—yet the keys of authority and power committed to his hands may be given to another, "even to the church," not to his posterity, mark you.

This revelation makes it easy to believe that there was inspiration in the declaration of Brigham Young, uttered when he heard for the first time of the martyrdom of Joseph and Hyrum. He was at Peterboro, N. H., when the sad intelligence reached him:—

The first thing that I thought of was whether Joseph had taken the keys of the kingdom with him from the earth. Brother Orson Pratt sat on my left, we were both leaning back in our chairs. Bringing my hand down on my knee, I said, *the keys of the kingdom are right here with the church.*—Roberts, pp. 93, 94.

Why Mr. Roberts should be anxious to prove the negative of that which we have not affirmed, we do not know; but we have not affirmed that Joseph took the keys of authority with him from the church.

Mr. Roberts' explanation of the above quotation is not very clear, but he evidently confounds the words "keys" and "oracles," making them to have the same meaning. This is evidently erroneous. We give the definitions of the two words as defined by Webster:—

Key:—

1. An instrument by means of which the bolt of a lock is shot or drawn; usually, a removable metal instrument fitted to the mechanism of a particular lock and operated by turning in its place.

2. An instrument which is turned like a key in fastening or adjusting any mechanism; as, a watch *key;* a bed *key*, etc.

3. That part of an instrument or machine which serves as the means of operating it; as, a telegraph *key;* the *keys* of a pianoforte, or of a typewriter.

4. A position or condition which affords entrance, control, or possession, etc.; as, the *key* of a line of defense; the *key* of a country; the *key* of a political situation. Hence, that which serves to unlock, open, discover, or solve something unknown or difficult; as, the *key* to a riddle; the *key* to a problem.

Those who are accustomed to reason have got the true *key* of books. *Locke.*

Who keeps the *keys* of all the creeds. *Tennyson.*

5. That part of a mechanism which serves to lock up, make fast, or adjust to position.

. . . . . .

Power of the keys (*Eccl.*), the authority claimed by the ministry in some Christian churches to administer the discipline of the church, and to grant or withhold its privileges;—so called from the declaration of Christ, "I will give unto thee the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven." *Matt.* xvi. 19.

Oracle:—

1. The answer of a god, or some person reputed to be a god, to an inquiry respecting some affair or future event, as the success of an enterprise or battle.

Whatso'er she saith, for *oracles* must stand. *Drayton.*

2. Hence: The deity who was supposed to give the answer; also, the place where it was given.

The *oracles* are dumb;
No voice or hideous hum
Runs through the arched roof in words deceiving. *Milton.*

3. The communications, revelations, or messages delivered by God to the prophets; also, the entire sacred Scriptures—usually in the plural.

The first principles of the *oracles* of God. *Heb.* v. 12.

4. (*Jewish Antiq.*) The sanctuary, or Most Holy place in the temple; also, the temple itself. 1 *Kings* vi. 19.

Siloa's brook, that flow'd
Fast by the *oracle* of God. *Milton.*

5. One who communicates a divine command; an angel; a prophet.

God hath now sent his living *oracle*
Into the world to teach his final will. *Milton.*

6. Any person reputed uncommonly wise; one whose decisions are regarded as of great authority; as, a literary *oracle*. "*Oracles* of mode." *Tennyson.*

The country rectors . . . thought him an *oracle* on points of learning. *Macaulay.*

7. A wise sentence or decision of great authority.

A careful inspection will convince the reader that no amount of straining will under any circumstances give them an equivalent meaning. A key is an instrument by which a person unlocks, while an oracle is that which is obtained by the unlocking; or in some cases may be applied to the person who uses the key. The above passage being figurative, the "keys" evidently represent the authority, while the "oracles" mean the revelations of God received by him who holds the keys, and is to be understood in the same sense as the following:—

I give unto you my servant Joseph, to be a presiding elder over all my church, to be a translator, a revelator, a seer, and prophet. I give unto him for counselors my servant Sidney Rigdon and my servant William Law, that these may constitute a quorum and first presidency, to receive the oracles for the whole church.—Doc. and Cov. 107:39.

The evident meaning, then, of the passage in question is that Joseph held the authority to receive revelation and that through him the revelations thus received were to be given to the church. However, if we grant that the word "oracles" in this passage is to be applied to the persons who deliver the revelations of God to the people, then it follows from the language, "*through you shall the oracles be*

given to another; yea, even unto the church," that Joseph Smith was to appoint his successor and through him his successor was to be presented to the church, thus sustaining our contention that Joseph Smith was to appoint his successor.

Further, if we were to admit Mr. Roberts' claim, illogical and untenable as it is, that "oracles" and "keys" are synonymous, and that the word "oracles" in this revelation refers to the keys of authority delivered to the Twelve, still the issue between us is not settled; for that part of the paragraph which Mr. Roberts does not quote administers a solemn warning unto those who "receive the oracles of God." It reads as follows:—

> And all they who receive the oracles of God, let them beware how they hold them, lest they are accounted as a light thing, and are brought under condemnation thereby; and stumble and fall, when the storms descend, and the winds blow, and the rains descend, and beat upon their house.—Doc. and Cov. 87:2.

Then, whatever the "oracles" may be, God's approval of those receiving them depends upon how they hold them. So that in any event, and upon the basis of any interpretation, the issue still rests upon *what was done*, and *how it was done.* We propose to hold these gentlemen to this issue and to demand that they answer for their acts.

Mr. Roberts next introduces the revelation of P. P. Pratt, which we have noticed on page 75; but there is nothing in it to help his case. As we have shown, there are two points in it that are against the people he represents; viz.: the necessity of reorganization, and the discouragement plainly given to fleeing into the wilderness and desert. The only comfort he can possibly get out of it is that the Twelve are recognized, and the reorganization was to be postponed until they returned. This we do not object to. We think they should have been respected and their proper authority recognized, and that it would have been decidedly improper to take any steps towards a

reorganization before their return; but this does not carry with it the approval of what they did after their return.

After some immaterial wanderings Mr. Roberts approaches the point as follows:—

> It now remains for me to prove that the prophet Joseph did give the "oracles to another"—and that they remained with the church.
>
> On the 7th of August, 1844, at a meeting of the Twelve Apostles, high council of the Nauvoo stake, and high priests, held in the Seventies' Hall, in a speech following one made by Sidney Rigdon, Brigham Young, speaking of the Twelve, said:
>
> Joseph conferred upon our heads all the keys and powers belonging to the apostleship which he himself held before he was taken away, and no man or set of men can get between Joseph and the Twelve in this world or the world to come. How often has Joseph said to the Twelve, "I have laid the foundation and you must build thereon, for upon your shoulders the kingdom rests."

Upon this statement of Brigham Young, quoted from the doubtful authority of *Millennial Star*, volume 25, and supposedly supported by the testimony of others, Mr. Roberts bases his case that Joseph Smith conferred all the keys held by himself upon the Twelve. If such an occurrence ever transpired it is impossible to determine by the testimony of the witnesses just what Joseph did say on the occasion. Evidently they do not remember, as no two of them give the same words, and where any one of them speaks twice he fails to reproduce the same language.

That the reader may compare them we reproduce such of them as we have at hand. We have one above from Brigham Young; here is another:—

> Joseph told the Twelve, the year before he died, "there is not one key or power to be bestowed on this church to lead the people into the celestial gate but I have given you, showed you, and talked it over to you; the kingdom is set up, and you have the perfect pattern, and you can go and build up the kingdom, and go in at the celestial gate, taking your train with you."—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 10, p. 115.

Parley P. Pratt renders it as follows:—

"I know not why; but for some reason I am constrained to hasten my preparations, and to confer upon the Twelve all the ordinances, keys, covenants, endowments, and sealing ordinances of the priesthood, and so set before them a pattern in all things pertaining to the sanctuary and the endowment therein."—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 5, p. 151.

Orson Hyde's version is as follows:—

Brother Joseph said some time before he was murdered, "If I am taken away, upon you, the Twelve, will rest the responsibility of leading this people, and do not be bluffed off by any man. Go forward in the path of your duty though you walk into death. If you will be bold and maintain your ground the great God will sustain you."—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 650.

Wilford Woodruff has spoken of this several times, but not using the same language twice. Here are some of his statements:—

Or has the Prophet Joseph found Elder Rigdon in his councils when he organized the quorum of the Twelve, a few months before his death, to prepare them for the endowment? And when they received their endowment, and actually received the keys of the kingdom of God, and oracles of God, keys of revelation, and the pattern of heavenly things; and thus addressing the Twelve, exclaimed, "Upon your shoulders the kingdom rests, and you must round up your shoulders, and bear it; for I have had to do it until now. But now the responsibility rests upon you. It mattereth not what becomes of me."—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 698.

This was in 1844, but the language was not strong enough to answer the purpose in 1892, so Mr. Woodruff gives it as follows:—

I remember the last speech that he ever gave us before his death. It was before we started upon our mission to the East. He stood upon his feet some three hours. The room was filled as with consuming fire, his face was as clear as amber, and he was clothed upon by the power of God. He laid before us our duty. He laid before us the fullness of this great work of God; and in his remarks to us he said: "I have had sealed upon my head every key, every power, every principle of life and salvation that God has ever given to any man who ever lived upon the face of the earth. And these principles and this Priesthood and power belong to this great and last dispensation which the God of Heaven has set His hand to establish in the earth." "Now," said he addressing the Twelve, "I have sealed upon

your heads every key, every power, and every principle which the Lord has sealed upon my head." Continuing, he said, "I have lived so long—up to the present time—I have been in the midst of this people, and in the great work and labor of redemption. I have desired to live to see this Temple [at Nauvoo] built. But I shall never live to see it completed; but you will." . . . [If he said this the prophecy failed. Not one of the then Twelve lived to see it completed.—H. C. S.]

After addressing us in this manner he said: "I tell you the burden of this kingdom now rests upon your shoulders; you have got to bear it off in all the world, and if you don't do it you will be damned."—Roberts, pp. 118, 119.

In April, 1898, Mr. Woodruff is reported as quoting Joseph Smith, as follows:—

You Apostles of the Lamb of God have been chosen to carry out the purposes of the Lord upon the earth. Now, I have received, as the Prophet, Seer and Revelator, standing at the head of this dispensation, every key, every ordinance, every principle and every Priesthood that belongs to the last dispensation and fulness of times. And I have sealed all these things upon your heads. Now, you Apostles, if you do not rise up and bear off this kingom, as I have given it to you, you will be damned.—Penrose, p. 23.

Examine these several statements carefully, and one thing will be very evident; viz., that we are not sure that we have the words of Joseph Smith, for the language is not given twice alike. If we have his words, tell us in which statement they are, that we may consider it. Another point we notice; that is, that the further we get from the time spoken of the stronger is the language used. This looks suspicious, manifesting as it does a disposition upon the part of the witnesses to exaggerate, which grew upon them with time. Brigham Young first speaks of that which was bestowed being the keys of the "*apostleship.*" Later he mentions it as the keys to lead into the celestial gate.

Elder Pratt says nothing of keys or leadership.

Elder Hyde is a little more modest than Brigham; he does not say a word about keys, but simply that the responsibility to lead was upon them.

In 1844 Elder Woodruff speaks freely of keys in his prelude, but does not quote Joseph as using the word, but simply that the responsibility of the kingdom rests upon the shoulders of the Twelve.

None of these testimonies is inconsistent with our position. But when this growing tendency to exaggerate manifested itself in 1892, how was it? Then it was made to appear that Joseph bestowed upon the Twelve every key, power, and principle which he (Joseph) had held. Yet this is too indefinite for the purpose, in 1898, and hence it is stated that every key, ordinance, principle, and priesthood belonging to the last dispensation, and which Joseph Smith held as Prophet, Seer, and Revelator, was bestowed upon the Twelve. This story has not lost anything; but if any man can tell what Joseph Smith said upon that occasion, let him come forward with it and we will give it respectful consideration.

In the meantime we will concede the probability that Joseph Smith told the Twelve that the responsibility of the work would rest upon them, and that by the legitimate exercise of the authority vested in them the people could be led into the celestial gates; but if so it would not justify them in assuming to act outside the duty of their calling as defined in the law.

Further, if in addition to the duty of the Twelve, as defined in the law, Joseph bestowed upon them *as a quorum* all the priesthood, power, and authority of the First Presidency, what need had they for a First Presidency? And what advantage was gained to the church by the forming of a First Presidency in 1847, and upon three different occasions since?

Mr. Roberts then introduces a statement from William Marks to the effect that he had been convinced that "the Twelve were the proper persons to lead the church." Suppose he did so state. He may have been mistaken.

Again, his indorsement of their being the proper ones was not an indorsement of their subsequent acts as leaders.

We do not affirm that Elder William Marks never erred; according to the prediction made of him by Joseph Smith, published by the Utah people themselves, the enemy was seemingly to gain some advantage over him, but he was finally to overcome because the hand of the Lord would be on his behalf. Here is the passage:—

> I would just say to brother Marks, that I saw in a vision while on the road, that whereas he was closely pursued by an innumerable concourse of enemies, and as they pressed upon him hard, as if they were about to devour him, and had seemingly obtained some degree of advantage over him, but about this time a chariot of fire came, and near the place, even the Angel of the Lord put forth his hand unto brother Marks, and said unto him, "Thou art my son, come here," and immediately he was caught up in the chariot, and rode away triumphantly out of their midst. And again the Lord said, I will raise thee up for a blessing unto many people. Now the particulars of this whole matter cannot be written at this time, but the vision was evidently given to me that I might know that the hand of the Lord would be on his behalf.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 16, p. 131.

Will our opponents explain from their standpoint in what way God raised up William Marks to become "a blessing unto many people"?

Mr. Roberts exclaims as a climax:—

> Since the church has never been disorganized, any organization claiming to be the "Reorganized church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" is a counterfeit, and writes fraud in the very title of it.—Roberts, p. 99.

To this we simply reply by a counter assertion, for which we have laid the foundation, and say: *Since* the church has been disorganized, any Latter Day Saint organization not "claiming to be the 'Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints' is a counterfeit, and writes fraud in the very title of it."

CHAPTER 9.

THE TWELVE — NECESSITY FOR A REORGANIZATION — CHURCH HELD TOGETHER — BUILDING OF NAUVOO, ETC. — DRIVEN TO ROCKY MOUNTAINS—JOSEPH'S PROPHECY—PRATT'S STATEMENT —ISAIAH'S PROPHECY — THE EXODUS — SEVENTIES — BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD—TEMPLE BUILDING—PERSECUTION.

MR. ROBERTS opens his ninth chapter with the following declaration:—

THERE is yet another line of evidence to be adduced in support of the great truth that the church has never been disorganized in this dispensation, and therefore has never stood in need of a "reorganization." That evidence is based upon the favor and blessing of God which has followed the church of Christ led by the Twelve Apostles from Nauvoo, and their successors in the leadership of the church.—Roberts, p. 100.

This opens the real issue, and most cheerfully do we meet it. By way of preliminary, however, we suggest that Mr. Roberts is unfortunate in having to represent a people on this issue who have conceded the necessity of a reorganization. This we have already shown from the purported revelation of Parley P. Pratt. (See p. 75.)

In addition to that we present a statement from a General Epistle of the Quorum of Twelve, written at Winter Quarters, Omaha Nation, December 23, 1847, and signed by Brigham Young, President, and Willard Richards, Clerk, as follows:—

Since the murder of President Joseph Smith, many false prophets and false teachers have arisen, and tried to deceive many, during which time we have mostly tarried with the body of the Church, or been seeking a new location, leaving those prophets and teachers to run their race undisturbed, who have died natural deaths, or committed suicides; and we now, having it in contemplation soon to reorganize the Church according to the original pattern, with a First Presidency and

Patriarch, feel that it will be the privilege of the Twelve, ere long, to spread abroad among the nations, not to hinder the gathering, but to preach the gospel, and push the people, the honest in heart, together from the four quarters of the earth.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 10, p. 86.

Mr. Roberts tries to dispose of this by asserting that it was the First Presidency that was to be reorganized, and not the church.

We can afford to leave this with simply placing the exact language upon record. The language cannot possibly be distorted to make the reorganization apply to the First Presidency alone; but it is clear and explicit, "*reorganize the Church according to the original pattern*, with a First Presidency and Patriarch."

Again, according to Mr. Roberts' own interpretation how can he escape connecting the Patriarch with the First Presidency, instead of limiting it to the Presidency?

But that we may not seem to misrepresent Mr. Roberts we append his comment, that the readers may see him and his methods in their true light:—

Josephites try to make it appear from a statement in the general epistle of the Twelve issued in 1847, to the effect that they were about to "reorganize" the church with a President and two counselors, that President Brigham Young and his associates considered the church disorganized, (see discourse by Alexander H. Smith, *The Saints' Herald* supplement of June 24th, 1893.) But it will be observed that the reorganization contemplated in the epistle of the Twelve is limited to reorganizing the First Presidency, the only quorum that was disorganized.—Footnote, p. 100.

We are now ready to consider in their order Mr. Roberts' specifications in support of his theory that God's favor and blessing have followed the church which he represents. He says:—

The first thing to be considered as indicating the favor of God which attended the church under the Presidency of the Twelve Apostles, is the fact that the church was held together through that trying period immediately following the martyrdom of the prophets Joseph and Hyrum.

If this were true it would not be sufficient proof of God's approval, as many corrupt organizations are held together under trying circumstances. But let us inquire how much truth there is in the assertion that the church was held together. We do not know just how many held to that organization, but they cannot claim more than their Church Historian and Recorder, Mr. Richards', estimate of the entire number of the church at the time, less the thousands who followed Rigdon, Strang, William Smith, and others. He says:—

The nearest we can approximate the number was about 26,000 to 27,000 souls.

(See his letter, p. 59.)

In making his estimate Mr. Richards would add to the number they had with them a fair estimate for those who followed other leaders; so their number must have been several thousand less than the above figures. To be exceedingly liberal we will say they had twenty thousand. What proportion was that of the whole? Joseph Smith's estimate in 1844 was 150,000. (See answer to Richards, p. 60.)

Wilford Woodruff, in April, 1845, reported the number of saints in America alone to be above *one hundred thousand.* This estimate would not be far from Joseph Smith's, who included the whole church. The following is the report of Mr. Woodruff:—

Elder Wilford Woodruff then rose to represent his conference, to which he had pledged himself at an early part of the day. He said that he represented about twenty-eight states of the American Union, above one hundred thousand saints, a quorum of twelve apostles, the various quorums in the stakes of Zion, fifteen quorums of the seventies, a conference with two temples of the Lord, one long ago completed, and one fast hastening to its completion.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 5, pp. 170, 171.

So they held together about two fifteenths of the entire church. And we are asked to accept this as an evidence of God's favor!

His next reason for adopting his conclusion he gives in the following:—

> Thus trusted by the saints the Twelve went on building upon the foundation laid by the prophet Joseph. They took steps to push the building up of Nauvoo, but their chief interest and their most strenuous efforts centered in completing the Temple and Nauvoo House.—Roberts, p. 101.

In all this they failed, neither building Nauvoo, nor the Temple, nor the Nauvoo House to completion, as we have shown. Surely this is not an evidence of God's favor.

After making the assertion regarding the temple, which we have before noticed, Mr. Roberts continues:—

> This accomplished, and mobocracy again raising its horrid front, to plague the church, the Twelve turned their faces towards the west; for they remembered that Joseph himself had prophesied that the saints would yet be driven to the Rocky Mountains, and there become a mighty people. — Roberts, p. 102.

In connection with this he explains in a footnote as follows:—

> Under date of *August 6th, 1842*, Joseph writes in his history: "I prophesied that the saints would continue to suffer much affliction, and would be driven to the Rocky Mountains, many would apostatize, others would be put to death by our persecutors, or lose their lives in consequence of exposure or disease, and some of you will live to go and assist in making settlements and build cities, and see them become a mighty people in the midst of the Rocky Mountains."

Mr. Roberts gives us no citation to aid us in finding a record of this purported revelation. For years they have been referring to such a prediction, but those using it either did not know or would not tell where it could be found. We have repeatedly asked that they produce it, but the only version of that prophecy that we have seen is found in the Biography of Anson Call published in the "History of Northern Utah and Southern Idaho," Vol. 2, by Tullidge. It is a little lengthy, but as so much has been said about this purported prediction we quote it in

full as given by Mr. Call, an accredited minister of the church which Mr. Roberts represents. The Historian says:—

On the 14th of July, 1843, with quite a number of his breth ren, he crossed the Mississippi River to the town of Montrose, to be present at the installment of the masonic lodge of the "Rising Sun." A block school house had been prepared with shade in front, under which was a barrel of ice water. Judge George Adams was the highest masonic authority in the state of Illinois and had been sent there to organize this lodge. He, Hyrum Smith and J. C. Bennett, being high Masons, went into the house to perform some ceremonies which the others were not entitled to witness. These, including Joseph Smith remained under the bowery. Joseph, as he was tasting the cold water, warned the brethren not to be too free with it. With the tumbler still in his hand he prophesied that the Saints would yet go to the Rocky Mountains; and, said he, this water tastes much like that of the crystal streams that are running from the snow capped mountains. We will let Mr. Call describe this prophetic scene: "I had before seen him in a vision and now saw while he was talking his countenance change to white; not the deadly white of a bloodless face, but a living brilliant white. He seemed absorbed in gazing at something at a great distance and said I am gazing upon the valleys of those mountains." This was followed by a vivid description of the scenery of these mountains as I have since become acquainted with it. Pointing to Shadrach Roundy and others, he said, "There are some men here who shall do a great work in that land." Pointing to me he said, "There is Anson, he shall go and shall assist in building cities from one end of the country to the other, and you," rather extending the idea to all those he had spoken of, "shall perform as great a work as has been done by man, so that the nations of the earth shall be astonished and many of them will be gathered in that land and assist in building cities and temples, and Israel shall be made to rejoice."

"It is impossible to represent in words this scene which is still vivid in my mind, of the grandeur of Joseph's appearance, his beautiful descriptions of this land, and his wonderful prophetic utterances as they emanated from the glorious inspirations that overshadowed him. There was a force and power in his exclamations of which the following is but a faint echo. 'Oh the beauty of those snow capped mountains. The cool refreshing streams that are running down through those mountain gorges." Then gazing in another direction, as if there was a change and locality: "Oh the scenes that this people

will pass through! The dead that will lay between here and there." Then, turning in another direction as if the scene had again changed; "Oh the apostasy that will take place before my brethren reach that land!" But he continued, "The priesthood shall prevail over all its enemies, triumph over the devil and be established upon the earth never more to be thrown down." He then charged us with great force and power, to be faithful in those things that had been and should be committed to our charge, with the promise of all the blessings that the priesthood could bestow. "Remember these things and treasure them up, Amen."—Biographical Supplement, pp. 271, 272.

It will be observed that the date given by Mr. Roberts and that given in this sketch do not agree, but evidently the same prediction is referred to. There is not a material point in this prediction that conflicts with our position. We concede that they went to the Rocky Mountains and did a great work in that land; that Mr. Roundy and Mr. Call assisted in that work; that the nations of the earth were astonished, and from the nations of the earth men gathered there to assist; and we have urged and do urge that there was a great apostasy before they reached that land. We believe that the priesthood will prevail over its enemies and triumph over the Devil; and that Joseph's exhortation to be faithful was timely and appropriate. The fulfillment of this prediction, if prediction it was, is to the credit of the Prophet, but no credit attaches to those who fulfilled the prophecy; for there is not a word in it to indicate that God had any more to do with their going to the Rocky Mountains, or with the work they did there, than he had with the apostasy that took place before they reached there.

Further, whether Joseph Smith predicted that they would go or not, it is evident that he did not approve of their going, or at least had not appointed that the church should locate in the West, for on June 23, 1844, four days before his death he wrote his wife:—

I do not know where I shall go or what I shall do, but shall if possible endeavor to get to the city of Washington.—Church History, Vol. 2, p. 770.

According to the purported revelation through Parley P. Pratt, God's instruction was for them not to fly to the wilderness and desert, but to stay in Nauvoo. (See p. 75.) Evidence can be produced in abundance that it was the intention of the leaders after the death of Joseph to remain and build up Nauvoo; but one statement from Elder Parley P. Pratt will be sufficient for the purpose of this work. In an epistle addressed "To the Saints in the Eastern States," and dated July 20, 1846, over two years after the death of the Prophet, Elder Pratt writes:—

Yes, my friends, think it not strange, if before ten years roll round, Nauvoo is the largest and most wealthy city in America, diffusing wealth, comfort, peace and knowledge through all parts of the West, and more or less to the whole world.

Think it not strange if a million of industrious Saints are congregated in that and the neighbouring cities, all acting in union, with one heart and mind, while every market in the world is supplied more or less with the productions of their skill and industry.

Think it not strange if kings, princes, nobles and great men come there with their rich presents in the name of the Lord, and to his sanctuary to seek knowledge, and to receive endowment and salvation, for themselves and their dead.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 6, p. 92.

Had it been decreed before Joseph's death that the body of the church should be removed to a location in the Rocky Mountains, would Mr. Pratt have written thus, more than two years afterward?

Certainly not. Then we cannot accept the fact of their being "*driven* to the Rocky Mountains," even though Joseph predicted it, as an evidence of God's approval. They had been warned through the Prophet that if they did not build the temple in due time they might share the same fate that had befallen them in Missouri (see p. 72); and now when the truth of that warning has been realized

we are asked to accept it as an evidence of God's approval. Strange philosophy!

In support of his interpretation of the above prophecy Mr. Roberts introduces the following:—

> Isaiah, too, long centuries before this time, had declared that it should come to pass
> In the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.—Roberts, p. 102.

Mr. Roberts is careful not to comment much upon this passage; but to make it apply as his context indicates he must give it a strained interpretation. He must make the word "mountain" to mean the church or kingdom of God; but its plural "mountains" to mean literal elevations of the earth's surface. If the word "mountain" means *kingdom* then the word "mountains" means *kingdoms*, and the plain, simple, and we believe correct rendering of the passage would be that God would establish his kingdom among the kingdoms of the world.

But if Mr. Roberts insists on interpreting the word "mountains" in the passage to mean literal mountains, to be consistent he should interpret "mountain" to be literal and have God raising a mountain of earth and stone upon the top of the Rocky Mountains. Perhaps we can assist Mr. Roberts a little here. We suggest that a more consistent interpretation than his would be to apply the word "mountain" to those piles of rock which the Mormons erected on the Rocky Mountains to push down on the United States army as it passed.

But, seriously, this passage does not in its main features apply to the American Continent. The verse preceding the one which Mr. Roberts quotes reads:—

> The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem.—Isaiah 2: 1.

Well may Mr. Roberts exclaim in the language of Bishop Warburton,

> Orthodoxy, my lord, is *my* doxy; and heterodoxy is some other man's doxy!—Roberts, p. 75.

Mr. Roberts next with great flourish points out how that people were led in the face of difficulties across the plains to the Rocky Mountains; the forming of colonies in Utah, Idaho, Arizona, Wyoming, and Colorado; the establishing of stakes of Zion; relief societies; improvement associations; Sunday schools; etc.

Though he has doubtless overdrawn the picture and painted its leading features in more brilliant hues than the facts would justify, we will not follow him, for all this is immaterial in establishing his claim that God's favor has followed that people, unless it is shown that the works cited were performed either by the direction or the approval of God.

Mr. Roberts next comes forward with the following:—

> Among the first acts of the Twelve after the martyrdom of Joseph and Hyrum was one to greatly increase the numbers of the seventies—the quorums of the priesthood which more especially constitute the foreign ministry of the church. At the October conference in 1844 the quorums of seventies were increased from two to ten. Since that time the seventies have been increased, until now they number one hundred and seven quorums, comprising a body of seven thousand men, whose special calling it is to preach the gospel abroad. Josephites complain against the church for thus increasing the number of quorums of seventy; and mark it down as a violation of the order of the church, and quote as proof the following from the Doctrine and Covenants:
>
> And these seven presidents are to choose other seventies, besides the first seventy, to whom they belong, and are to preside over them; and also other seventy, until seven times seventy, if the labor in the vineyard of necessity requires it.
>
> This they say limits the number of quorums to seven, and therefore no more than seven ought to be chosen. The prophet Joseph, however, when the first quorums of seventy were being organized said:
>
> If the first Seventy are all employed, and there is a call for more laborers, it will be the duty of the seven Presidents of the

first Seventy to call and ordain other seventy and send them forth to labor in the vineyard, until if needs be, they set apart seven times seventy, and even until there are one hundred and forty and four thousand thus set apart for the ministry.—Roberts, pp. 105, 106.

Yes, the Twelve did at that time increase the number of seventies, not only to ten, but to eleven full quorums, and about forty of the twelfth quorum. (See *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 696.) And truly it was the *Twelve* that did it. The law providing that the Seven Presidents of Seventy should choose was ignored, as the following extracts from the minutes of the conference will show:—

Elder G. A. Smith moved that all in the elders' quorum under the age of thirty-five should be ordained into the seventies, if they are in good standing, and worthy, and will accept it. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 695.

He [Brigham Young] also selected a number more to go into the seventies, after which the remainder of the morning was spent in calling out the several quorums of seventies, and giving charges to the several presidents.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 696.

This indiscriminate ordaining of men without regard to the law or a calling from God is one of the things we complain of.

One thing is certain; there is no provision in the law for more than seven quorums of seventy. If Joseph Smith did say what Mr. Roberts quotes him as saying, his unsupported word is not law; especially when he is out of harmony with the law. Again, there have been so many things written into his history since his death that we are slow to believe him guilty of writing that not warranted in the law, until we have more proof than can be found in doubtful publications.

Mr. Roberts quotes this purported statement of Joseph Smith from the *Millennial Star*, volume 15, which was published in 1853. This is especially suspicious when we consider that nine years before its publication they had

transcended the bounds of the law in an irregular and indiscriminate way; and something of this kind was needed to bolster up their past acts.

Then, while we do not accept Joseph Smith's word in preference to the law, we refuse, upon such testimony, to place the responsibility of this departure at his door.

Mr. Roberts proceeds to enumerate the countries where they have done missionary work and the periodicals and books they have published, all of which could have been done without God's approval, hence it is irrelevant.

After an introduction on the necessity for and the great benefit of the doctrine of baptism for the dead, Mr. Roberts gives us a tabulated statement of the number receiving this ordinance in the temples of St. George, Logan, Manti, and Salt Lake, as an evidence of the great work done by the people of Utah; but in addition to this he gives a statement of the number of "Ordinations to the priesthood for the dead;" "Endowments for the dead;" "Sealings (husbands and wives) for the dead;" "Sealings (children to parents) for the dead;" none of which is contemplated in the law of God; nor does Mr. Roberts attempt to show any justification for these additions.

Baptism for the dead is only legal and acceptable when performed either in Zion, or her stakes, or in Jerusalem, and in a house dedicated to and accepted by God, as the following will show:—

For, verily I say unto you, that after you have had sufficient time to build a house to me, wherein the ordinance of baptizing for the dead belongeth, and for which the same was instituted from before the foundation of the world, your baptisms for your dead cannot be acceptable unto me; for therein are the keys of the holy priesthood ordained, that you may receive honor and glory. And after this time, your baptisms for the dead, by those who are scattered abroad, are not acceptable unto me, saith the Lord; for it is ordained that in Zion, and in her stakes, and in Jerusalem, those places which I have appointed for refuge, shall be the places for your baptisms for your dead.

And again, verily I say unto you, How shall your washings be acceptable unto me, except ye perform them in a house which you have built to my name? For, for this cause I commanded Moses that he should build a tabernacle, that they should bear it with them in the wilderness, and to build a house in the land of promise, that those ordinances might be revealed which had been hid from before the world was; therefore, verily I say unto you, that your anointings, and your washings, and your baptisms for the dead, and your solemn assemblies, and your memorials for your sacrifices, by the sons of Levi, and for your oracles in your most holy places, wherein you receive conversations, and your statutes and judgments, for the beginning of the revelations and foundation of Zion, and for the glory, honor, and endowment of all her municipals, are ordained by the ordinance of my holy house, which my people are always commanded to build unto my holy name.—Doc. and Cov. 107: 11, 12.

Therefore, before introducing this line of evidence Mr. Roberts should have laid the foundation for it by showing that St. George, Logan, Manti, and Salt Lake City were in Zion, or her stakes, or in Jerusalem. This he has made no attempt to do, and we might leave it here, as it has not properly come before us, hence is not entitled to consideration. However, we will make a few references which will aid the reader in getting at the true status of their temples and temple building, of which they boast so much.

The clause in the above quotation concerning the house of God "which my people are always commanded to build," is interpreted to mean a standing commandment, always in force, to build a house unto the Lord. Mr. Penrose says of this:—

That was a commandment which the Lord says is always given to his people.—Penrose, p. 5.

The Lord says no such thing. There is a difference between a *commandment* "*always* given," and the words of the book "*always commanded.*" "Always commanded," evidently means that they are not authorized to build without a command. That it is to be so understood is evident from the fact that in each case a separate and dis-

tinct command was given regarding the building of the temples at Kirtland, Independence, and Nauvoo. The circumstances attendant and instruction attending the attempted temple building at Far West are also very plain upon this point, as the following extracts will show:—

The same day, August 5th, the Presidency, High Council, and all the authorities of the Church in Missouri, assembled in council at Far West, and unanimously resolved to go on moderately and build a house unto the name of the Lord in Far West, as they had means, and appointed Edward Partridge treasurer, to receive all the donations and subscriptions for the erection of the House of the Lord; Isaac Morley to be his secretary.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 16, p. 54.

Here was an attempt to build a temple without revelation. How did it terminate? Read the following:—

Also voted unanimously, that it is the opinion of this council, that there is sufficient room in this country, for the churches to continue gathering from abroad; also that the building of the House of the Lord be postponed, till the Lord shall reveal it to be his will to be commenced.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 16, p. 89.

Mr. Andrew Jenson, a voluminous writer of the Utah Church, says of this:—

When Joseph arrived there he counseled that the building of that house should be postponed until the Lord should reveal it to be his will to have it commenced.—Historical Record, Vol. 7, p. 434.

In the above we see the counsel of Joseph Smith on temple building, which plainly controverts the erroneous idea that a commandment to build is given in perpetuity, justifying the building at any time without special direction. Compare with this the utterances of Brigham Young on February 14, 1853, when the ground was consecrated for the temple in Salt Lake City:—

Some might query whether a revelation had been given to build a house to the Lord, but he is a wicked and slothful servant who doeth nothing but what his Lord commandeth, when he knoweth his master's will. I know a Temple is needed, and so do you; and when we know a thing, why do we need a revelation to compel us to do that thing? If the Lord and all the

people want a revelation, I can give one concerning this Temple.

In a few days I shall be able to give a plan of the Temple on paper, and then if all heaven, or any good man on the earth will suggest any improvements, we will receive and adopt them.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 15, p. 391.

Brigham Young not only proceeded then without revelation, but boastfully and blasphemously notified the Lord that if he wished a revelation Brigham could give one. Brigham was first to give his plan, and then if heaven or any good man would suggest any improvements they were to be adopted. And we are asked to accept such work as an evidence of the "favor and blessing of God" upon a people, and to believe that the house builded under such circumstances is the temple of the Most High.

Nor are we given any assurance that the edifices called temples at St. George, Manti, and Logan are built by any better authority.

To-day the title to the Kirtland Temple, the only one now standing in the world which was built by the command of God, is in the Reorganization, and we hold ourselves in readiness to build, or assist to build, any other house when directed to do so by the command of God; but our souls revolt at the thought of accepting as God's house a building the plan of which was devised by Brigham Young and announced to the church in such boastful and disrespectful language. We can scarcely conceal our indignation at the impudence that asks us to accept works done in such places as evidence of the "favor and blessing of God."

Mr. Roberts next seeks to make a point by claiming that the people of God were to be persecuted, and quoting passages of scripture to that effect, and then adding:—

Since the death of the prophet Joseph, the same Powers which pursued him and the work he established have continued their hostilities against the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. It is the elders of that church, not the elders of

the Reorganized church, who have been hunted by mobs, and beaten for no other crime than calling men to repentance. It is the blood of the elders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, not of the "Reorganized church," which today unavenged crimsons the soil of the states of Georgia, Tennessee and Mississippi.

It is the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, not the "Reorganized church" which has been constantly assailed, despoiled of its property, its members driven into exile, hundreds thrust into prison, whole communities terrorized—and all this through the administrators of the government acting under a mistaken zeal created by the persistent misrepresentations of sectarian priests and religious bigots—some of our "friends" of high standing in the "Reorganization" joining in the hue and cry against the saints of God and aiding in the work of misrepresentation.—Roberts, p. 111.

This is partly true and partly untrue. More than once has the writer of these lines faced lawless mobs; several of his brethren have done the same. We "*have* been hunted by mobs, and beaten for no other crime than calling men to repentance." But, thank God, the opposition we have met, like that which was encountered by our fathers in the days of the martyr Joseph, has been *lawless* opposition. We have not been convicted of crime by courts of justice; nor are the leading offices of the Reorganization filled by ex-convicts from the penitentiary. If there is any glory in a criminal record, Mr. Roberts and his associates are welcome to it; but we prefer the sentiment of the apostle Peter:—

For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing, than for evil doing.—1 Peter 3: 17.

That since the early days of persecution we have gained some favor where we are best known, is true; but we have done so in harmony with and in fulfillment of the following promise of the Lord given in 1834:—

And let all my people who dwell in the regions round about, be very faithful, and prayerful, and humble before me, and reveal not the things which I have revealed unto them, until it is wisdom in me that they should be revealed. Talk not judgment, neither boast of faith, nor of mighty works; but carefully

gather together, as much in one region as can be consistently with the feelings of the people: and, behold, I will give unto you favor and grace in their eyes, that you may rest in peace and safety, while you are saying unto the people, Execute judgment and justice for us according to law, and redress us of our wrongs.—D. C. 102: 7.

The Reorganization has by action of the body, as well as through its committees and representatives, favored wholesome legislation against the crimes of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation; but we challenge the proof that we have aided "in the work of misrepresentation."

Having now followed Mr. Roberts to the close of his attack, and considered every material point, we submit our answer to the careful consideration of the reader, and pay our respects to Mr. Penrose, after which we will treat the subject from a more direct standpoint.

CHAPTER 10.

PENROSE—LEADING SPIRITS—WOODRUFF'S TESTIMONY—DISCIPLINE—SPENCER INTERVIEW.

NOW COMES Mr. Charles W. Penrose with his "Priesthood and Presidency;" but our reply to him will be brief, as in replying to Mr. Roberts, and in incidental mention of Mr. Penrose's work, we have considered the most of his material points.

Mr. Penrose, like Mr. Roberts, whom he apes, generally contents himself in assertions for which he offers no proof. We have in these pages so frequently called attention to this method that it is only necessary here to ask the reader to carefully discriminate between that which is asserted and that for which proof is offered. We shall therefore not reply to many of his unsupported assertions. Here is one, however, which we wish to notice. Speaking of the Reorganization he says:—

> Its leading spirits are chiefly persons who have been excommunicated from the Church of Christ for apostasy and other offenses.—Penrose, p. 3.

We suppose that by the "Church of Christ" Mr. Penrose means the church he represents; but, like Mr. Roberts, he assumes without proof that it is the Church of Christ.

If, with this explanation, his assertion is true, according to Mr. Roberts' philosophy (see p. 34) the Reorganization is a stream flowing chiefly from the church in Utah, and partaking of its nature and characteristics. Of what then can Mr. Penrose complain? However, his assertion is not true. Of the fifteen composing the First Presidency and the Quorum of Twelve Apostles, but one was ever connected with the church in Utah; and he was never expelled for

any criminal offenses, if indeed he was ever expelled at all. Just how many Mr. Penrose would include as leading spirits, we do not know; but an examination will disclose, we think, about the same proportion; viz., that no more than one in fifteen, in the other quorums, have communed with the church Mr. Penrose represents. We challenge the proof that any of these few were ever legally expelled or ever regularly charged with criminal conduct; or that any action was ever taken against them by this so-called Church of Christ prior to their having united with the Reorganization.

Mr. Roberts has us all Strangites and William Smithites, and Mr. Penrose has us all Brighamites; and yet they have the audacity to say that we are not persecuted!

The testimony of Mr. Woodruff, as quoted by Mr. Penrose, on page 23 of his pamphlet, is faulty, and would not be accepted in a court of justice. He says:—

> Joseph Smith never ordained his son Joseph, never blessed him nor set him apart to lead this church and kingdom on the face of the earth. When he or any other man says he did, they state that which is false before high heaven.

Mr. Woodruff could not possibly know what he here affirms. To suppose that he did is to suppose that he was constantly with Joseph Smith, and especially so at the times and places where it is claimed that the blessing was pronounced. At the time Joseph Smith was in Liberty Jail Mr. Woodruff was not there, nor was he in the State of Missouri at all during the perilous times of 1837 and 1838, according to Brighamite publications. Further, he was not always present in Nauvoo, and hence could not know whereof he affirms. We feel a profound sympathy for Mr. Woodruff, and we are sorry that Mr. Penrose has had so little respect for this old man in his dotage as to drag him before the public by quoting his childish utterances.

Mr. Penrose says:—

In the true church there are order and discipline under competent authority; in the "Josephite" society there are disorder, confusion and continual contention, which Christ says is of the devil (III Nephi xi: 29).—Penrose, p. 29.

In this connection allow us to produce two statements from leading men in the Utah Church, and we could produce much more of the same sort.

Here is what B. H. Roberts says of Governor Wells:—

"When the sow that has been washed returns to her wallowing in the mire, we smile at it.

"When the dog turns to his vomit, we sicken at it.

"When the bird fouls its own nest, we are filled with disgust.

"But when a man—and that man a Governor of a State—discredits the marriage system which gave him birth, stamps the brand of dishonor on his own parents, and assumes an attitude that carried to its legitimate conclusions, would put his own sisters beyond the pale of the law and mark them as outcasts, then there is no comparison that can express one's contempt and disgust for such a craven.

"I knew Gov. Wells's father. An honorable man he was, possessed of broad views and statesmanlike qualities. When I think of this noble character, I can only wonder that he begot so unworthy and craven a son."—*Salt Lake Semi-Weekly Tribune*, Nov. 8, 1898.

And here is Wells on Roberts:—

Aside from the trouble his election would create, a man whose character is marked by every act that may define a demagogue and who seems to be in constant need of a guardian to keep him in his party and in his church, is scarcely worthy the suffrage of his people.—Ibid.

Until Mr. Penrose can point to something among us approximating to this, he should cease to draw comparisons and to boast of pacific conditions. The above are only fair specimens of many of the kind that have attended their career from 1844 until the present.

As all material points in the body of Mr. Penrose's work are answered in the foregoing pages, we leave it; but we wish to give brief notice to his appendix, which purports to contain an account of an interview that S. G. Spencer *et*

al. had with President Joseph Smith at Independence, Missouri, March 18, 1896. On page 33 Mr. Penrose makes Mr. Spencer to say:—

All the foregoing questions were formulated and written, with space left for answers, before we called on Joseph Smith; and the answers, although in one or two instances necessarily abbreviated (when they were long, and insufficient space had been left), are word for word as answered, finally, by him.

On page 35 he makes Spencer *et al.* to say:—

We declare in words of soberness, knowing full well that no "liar" shall inherit the kingdom of God, that the answers are complete to the questions asked in said interview, entirely free from any misleading feature.

There is something wrong here. These answers cannot be both "abbreviated" and "complete."

In Mr. Penrose's closing remarks he says:—

The unbiased reader will perceive that Mr. Smith does not make any specific denial or refutation of the statements furnished to the *News* by the four Elders who conversed with him. —Penrose, p. 36.

Had Mr. Penrose given President Smith's version of that interview, the unbiased reader would see quite differently. We here give his statement that the "unbiased" reader may compare:—

STATEMENT OF INTERVIEW.

"LAMONI, Iowa, May 19, 1896.

"BRO. J. M. STUBBART,
"Octavia, Nebraska.

"Yours of 15th received. In reply, Messrs. S. G. Spencer, E. S. Hart, A. G. Young, and W. E. Criddle, were at Bro. Joseph Luff's house, and Mr. Spencer did the talking. He asked me several questions; the form of which I do not remember. If he had them written, I did not see them; but he certainly has not given the answers as I gave them. He had asked me for an interview, and I granted it. He brought the others with him at his own motion, and without consulting me. I had no thought he would misrepresent me. If he had the questions numbered and set down, I did not see them; nor were his minutes of what I said submitted to me for correction. I hoped that neither he, nor either of them, would go away and lie about me.

"1. Do you claim to be a prophet of God?

"*Ans.*—I claim to occupy the position and office my father did.

"2. Did your father ordain you to be a prophet to lead the church?

"*A.*—Not in the sense of installing me in the leadership, for he was living and occupying. But in the sense of conferring on me by his blessing and the laying on of his hands whatever appertained to me as his son and his successor, he did, using the word 'ordain' to mean blessing, conferring and confirming upon me whatever he held that could descend to me as his son by right of lineage. He did this in Liberty Jail, in Missouri; and again at Nauvoo, some time before his death, after I was baptized, in the Brick Store and in the presence of witnesses, of whom James Whitehead, now of Lamoni, was one. Whether he used the word 'ordain' I do not know. He again laid hands upon me and blessed me to the same blessing, just before he left Nauvoo for Carthage, in the north room of the Mansion, at which time a number were present. Whether this may be considered an ordination or not; it was a setting apart by blessing; and I have so considered it.

"3. You say a voice told you to join the Reorganized Church. Is it not possible that the voice was from a seducing spirit—a transformed devil—instead of from God?

"To this question, though I believe the latter part respecting a transformed devil has been added since, I replied in substance:—

"'That is not a fair question, Elder Spencer, and is asked with a view to make capital out of a possible answer. I went to God, earnestly asking for direction, as my father did. The conditions were similar; and I believed that if there was a man on earth who had the right to believe that God would deal fairly with him, I was that man. I believe that now. I asked in sincerity, "Where shall I go?" And I was told as plainly as I can hear you speak to-day, to "join the Reorganized Church." I am not prepared to admit, in any sense, that I was deceived; or that the voice was that of a seducing or evil spirit. I am not prepared to say or to believe that God would either deceive me or suffer any evil or lying spirit to deceive me. To admit that would be to throw doubt on every manifestation said to have been received during the rise of the church. It would subject the statements of Joseph Smith, David Whitmer, and others who said they saw angels, and heard them, to grave discredit. No, sir; I do not admit that there was, or could have been, any deception or deceiving spirit in the case.'

"Mr. Spencer tried in several ways to get me to admit that it might have been a deception; but I did not at any time make such admission. He has given in two lines what I did not say:

except that I told him I 'heard a voice.' That much is true. I would not and did not say that it could be, or was deceptive. I fully believed it to be true and from God, in answer to my prayer.

"He asked me if I claimed to be an apostle, and I told him 'Yes;' that as my father and O. Cowdery were apostles, after the ordination that made them the first and second elders of the church in 1830, so was I an apostle.

"4. Who ordained you? (The word 'apostle' was not used in this question at that time.)

"*A.*—William Marks, who was president of the High Council at Nauvoo, and president of the stake at Father's death; William Blair, and Zenas H. Gurley. Elder Gurley was a seventy in Father's lifetime. Elder Blair had been baptized by my Uncle William, who was one of the Twelve at Father's death; these men ordained me to be an high priest; I was then chosen to be president of the church, and set apart to the office.

"I furthermore told him that neither Marks nor Gurley had ever been divested of the authority they held in Father's time.

"5. Did they hold the office of apostle?

"*A.*—Marks was not an apostle, in the sense of being one of the Twelve; Blair and Gurley had been chosen to the apostleship.

"6. If not, how could he give something he never had?

"*A.*—Anyone holding the Melchisedec priesthood, could, at the command of God, ordain to any office in the church; and could in case the necessity required it, perform any duty that the apostle might under the same conditions. It is provided for in the revelation on priesthood, section 104, of our book. Don't know what section in yours.

"7. Question and answer about correct.

"8. Have you ever seen an angel or heavenly personage?

"*A.*—I have seen personages that I believe to have been angels. I then cited to some instances, among them the one referred to; but not in reference to 'getting a doctor.' It was in regard to my *administering to those* who being sick employed a doctor. I had about concluded not to do so; when I received the visitation referred to. I believed it to be a messenger sent by the good powers above, to show me my duty. It had no more reference to my sending for a doctor than it had to whether I should hire a horse, or buy a dog. I would not say whether this was an angel, as the word 'angel' is sometimes used; but it was certainly a messenger, and not a human personage, such as a living man in the flesh, like you and me. This was in substance the answer I gave in my talk on the subject. I referred him to the men who appeared to Abram as he sat in his tent at the close of the day.

"9. I think in this question Spencer used the words 'prac-

ticed polygamy.' To this I replied as stated, adding, 'She always denied it; not only to me but to others.'

"10. Did she, Emma Smith, ever deny to you that he ever had the revelation on spiritual marriage?

"*A.*—She said that so far as her knowledge went he never had that revelation. That she believed that he did not have it, or give it to the church. That she never saw it, never heard it read, never burned it, or had it burned, and never had anything to do with it whatever. Personally, I do not believe that he did give such revelation; though I do not know.

"11 and 12. There was nothing said about the practice of polygamy in the millennium. The question had reference to the 'resurrection;' and I replied that I knew nothing about the laws that would govern in the resurrection. That I accepted what Jesus said that in the resurrection there was neither marrying nor giving in marriage. That I knew of no authentic teaching that defined what the conditions there would be in detail; but that personally I was contented to accept the conditions of the laws ordained of God to govern there when I got there. That I had lost one wife and had another, and that I was not troubled about whether I should have one, both, or none at all over on the other side. The revelation referred to by Bro. Luff was that in answer to prayer upon the question of plural marriage, or polygamy, I was commanded to 'have nothing to do with it, only to oppose it.' And I stated that I had kept the commandment to the best of my ability.

"13. Do you believe that you will assist us in building this temple—the one to be built here in Independence?

"(Here Bro. Luff suggested, 'Had you not better ask whether you will assist us? We claim to be the church in succession.')

"There was no question whether I thought we would unite with the organized church in Utah; except in the idea of assisting to build the temple in Independence.

"I replied: 'As to the question of who will build or assist to build the temple here (at Independence), I have no opinion to express. I am quite willing that the people indicated by God as his people shall build it. If I and my brethren with me shall be thought worthy of building, or even assisting to build it, all right; I shall be satisfied for the will of God to prevail in the matter.'

"14. The question of authority in Utah came up, but I do not believe the question was in the form of number 14. I think it was simply, 'Do you believe the church in Utah has authority to administer in the ordinances?'

"I replied; that we of the Reorganized Church had always held that there were those in the church that went to Utah and affiliated with that body who held priesthood derived from the church in Father's time. That undoubtedly there were some

there still who had not forfeited their priesthood by transgression, and had the right to act for Christ; but that this did not attach to them as a body; only as individuals.

"Elder Spencer here interjected, 'President Woodruff, for instance?'

"I continued: 'Excuse me; I do not care to answer the question as to the individuals by name. Each case must be determined by the conditions when the questions as to individuals may arise for consideration; if such contingency occurs.'

"16. 'Do you say [I think the word "hold" was used] that you have authority to administer in the ordinances of the gospel?'

"*A.*—Yes sir. I fully believe that I have such authority. And the evidences of the Lord's acceptance and indorsement of my ministry during the last thirty years are quite numerous. I then related some of them.

"17. In reply to the question of who would lead the Reorganized Church in case of my death, I told Mr. Spencer; that the care of the church would devolve upon the Twelve *as a quorum*, until my successor was pointed out by revelation. That the same rights that I held as the son of my father would descend to my sons. But that the calling of anyone depended on *worthiness*, as well as lineage, or birthright. That the question of the succession of a son to what his father held would turn on the question of worth, other things being equal. But that the Lord by his Spirit would determine the call.

"18. I have no recollection of any such question as No. 18; certainly, not in that form. It was evidently a forcing of the text referring to the turning of the hearts of the fathers to the sons, and of the sons to the fathers, etc., and the delay referred to was in reference to the baptism for the dead, etc. I had nothing to say why the Lord had not given a permissive command since the stoppage in such ministration mentioned in the revelation of 1841; and I so told Mr. Spencer.

"19. Mr. Spencer's question about endowments and baptisms for the dead was answered by me in this way: 'I know of nothing in the books, nor published teachings of Joseph Smith and his fellow ministers teaching or authorizing endowments. Nor do I *know* whether any endowments were given in Nauvoo during my father's lifetime.' I *knew* of none, I did know that there were some baptisms for the dead *in the river* at Nauvoo for I saw them performed. I did not tell him that there were endowments, for I knew of none. My answer as he gives it makes me to say there were endowments as well as baptisms for the dead; which is not true.

"20. Have you ever inhabited the Nauvoo House?

"*A.*—I have not lived in the house as a residence. My step-

father finished a part of it, and my mother lived there with him for several years, and died in it in April, 1879. I cannot say what my posterity may do. Personally, I do not expect to live in the Nauvoo House, in its present condition and ownership. It is now occupied and owned by the widow and son of my stepfather, Lewis Bidamon. My stepfather tore down a part of the building and built up another.

"22. I do not think this question was framed in this way. I think the question was fixed up after the men left me. The question was, 'If what is promised, that is, a residence in the Nauvoo House, has failed to be fulfilled, might it not be possible that any other promise made in the same revelation may fail also?'

"To this I replied: 'Yes, it is possible that any promise made to man may fail so far as he is personally concerned; for the reason that all the promises of God to man are conditional, and worthiness or unworthiness has much to do with such things. But I am not aware that the loss of any priesthood right I may have been entitled to as the son of the prophet is involved in the loss of a residence in the Nauvoo House.'

"23. There was no question asked me in regard to my father leaving the keys with me. The question was, 'Did not your father take the keys of his priesthood with him; as the revelation says they shall not be taken from him?' I answered that the revelation stated that the keys of this kingdom should not be taken from him, neither here, nor in the world to come. That unless he transgressed, what was his and what accrued to him because of his faithful work, should be continued his. But that this did not affect the fact of his place being made vacant, nor the right of myself, or another to occupy, if God so willed it. And that the oracles were to be given through him to the church. That men, whether apostles or prophets, were not oracles in the sense of the term used in the revelations. That the oracles there named were the commandments of God contained in the books, or the books themselves for that matter; and the revelations of God to the church. That the revelations and commandments of God were given to the church as a whole, and not to the Twelve alone; and that was one of our reasons for the course we had taken. That, in our judgment, those oracles had been treated as a light thing, and condemnation had resulted, as the revelation stated.

"Mr. Spencer then asked me whether the apostles were not the leading quorum after the Presidency, as the Savior said, 'first, apostles,' etc.

"To this I answered, 'Yes.' I then added: 'I have always held that, had the *Twelve*, as a *quorum*, taken the lead at the death of Father and Uncle Hyrum, and carried on the work righteously, and in accordance with the gospel as given to

Joseph Smith by the angel, continuing in their places as missionaries to the world, until the Lord had revealed, or called on the one he chose to lead, or become president in its time, there would never have occurred such a scene of apostasy as took place. Nor would there have been a doctrine so evil introduced as we believed had been forced upon the church. That the Twelve, as a quorum, should have taken such steps as guarded the church from imposition, until such time as the one chosen of God to lead had been called, as that quorum was next in authority; but that the Twelve in authority of decision was only one of three, which were equal, as the section on priesthood clearly stated—the Presidency, the Twelve, the Seventy.' (See Sec. 104.)

"It was in this connection that I said the Twelve were the proper ones to lead after Father's death; and I qualified it as I here have stated. I did not, at any time nor in any way indorse the idea, nor the fact that the right to lead the church, at the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, devolved unqualifiedly on the Twelve; though Bro. Luff stated after they were gone that Spencer would so report me.

"I know of no revelation to me on the relation to married people, as asked of in question 12, other than the ones referred to by me in my biography, in which I was told that polygamy was not of God. And I stated to Mr. Spencer, that as I had asked the Lord which church I should join; so had I asked in regard to polygamy, and had been as clearly and positively told that polygamy was not of God. I recollect of no other revelation. If Bro. Luff referred to any other I know nothing of what it was he referred to.

"This interview lasted from about 9 a. m. to nearly half past 11. Mr. Spencer was the talker; the rest scarcely joining in the chat. The talk was long and apparently friendly. I made no statements and took no positions that were either untrue in themselves, or if understood were damaging. That Mr. Spencer and his men may distort and twist what I did say appears to be possible. Mr. Spencer expressed the hope that there might be a unity of the two, 'you and us,' as he expressed it. To this both Bro. Luff and I expressed assent, if it could be done on the lines laid down of the Lord in the works of the church—his word and his will.

"I do not take the position that both the Utah Church and the Reorganized Church are baptizing into the same body of Christ. I took no such grounds with Mr. Spencer. Both Bro. Luff and I gave them to understand that we claimed to be the church in succession. That we had nothing to conceal; and were willing what we had done to be investigated.

"I believe the 'set time' referred to, cannot be properly applied to the practice of endowments and baptisms for the

dead. I know of no endowments being practiced in Father's time. There were baptisms for the dead for awhile in the river until stopped, as referred to in section 107, revelation of 1841. I am satisfied that the endowments practiced in Utah were not had in Father's time; they may have been in Nauvoo after he died; though personally I know of none then.

"I never lived in the 'Nauvoo House.' I did live in the Nauvoo Mansion. It would be possible to build the Nauvoo House, and me live in it yet if God so ordered it to be done.

"I did not say the leadership vested in the apostles; I did say that had they remained in their places, and iniquity kept out of the church, the great confusion and wrong that resulted would not have been possible. The conversation on the leadership question was quite long; and some of the answers as sent by you are not only not full, but are absolutely incorrect; as in question 23, which has three in one; and the answer to one, 'Yes,' referring to the keys being taken by Father, etc., is right; but wrong to each of the others. My answers were full, and plain; at the same time, guarded from incorrectness, especially so in regard to the priesthood and lineal right. They have cooked both questions and answers.

"You are at liberty to withstand Elder Criddle or any of them, all over Kansas, so far as I am concerned. Bro. J. R. Lambert is in charge and will give help if needed. But they will not meet you. Those men are not at liberty to use or misuse an interview with me which Mr. Spencer said was for their own private benefit. Besides this, the elders are not bound by any absurd answer of mine to baffling questions, contrary to the books of the church. Yours in bonds,

"JOSEPH SMITH."

The foregoing, in connection with Mr. Spencer's version, is published in tract form, and can be obtained at the Herald Office, Lamoni, Iowa.

The following letter from the pen of Elder Joseph Luff, who was present at the interview, is important:—

STONINGTON, Me., Sept. 4, 1898.

ELDER ROBT. J. PARKER, Springville, Utah;

Dear Bro.:—Upon my arrival here this morning, yours of the 16th of August was found awaiting me, having been forwarded from home. It finds me with somewhat improved health, for which I feel thankful to God.

Regarding the statement which you say is being circulated there, to the effect that I would not deny the correctness of the

report published in the *Deseret News* regarding the interview had in my house and in my presence, between President Joseph Smith and Elder Spencer and three other elders of the Utah Church, I have only this to say and *I put it plainly:* IT IS FALSE. I *have* denied its correctness more than fifty times, and many of the Utah elders whom I have met in various places know that I have denied it with emphasis to them and pointed out some of its almost self-evident falsities. It is a garbled thing in some of its parts. It is disarranged as to the order of the real interview, and in other instances it states the *very opposite* of what President Smith said. When the thing was first shown to me I denounced it as a vicious misrepresentation of the interview and wrote to President Smith to that effect. I pointed out several of its bad features to different parties.

The statement afterwards published by President Smith relative to the interview is correct, and a copy of it can be had at Herald Office. Surely those people who account President Smith to be a *knave* will not pretend to believe him to be a *fool;* yet such he must needs be if in that interview he said what those elders published over their names, for it sets forth a direct contradiction of his public and private utterances and all his writings on the subjects involved, as can be easily discovered by reference to said writings. If Elder Spencer intended to honestly represent President Smith, he ought to have pursued a different course from that which he followed. He pretended to have some questions down in writing and would ask one at a time, then begin writing when an answer was given, and, that too without hearing the answers in full. He never showed us a line he had written nor read a line of it in our hearing. As these men left my house door I turned to President Smith and said: "The next time you hear from that interview you will scarcely be able to identify it," and the sequel proved that I was correct. It was a scandalous piece of work and far beneath the dignity of men, to say nothing of *elders* of a *church*, and you are perfectly at liberty to use this statement from me wherever and however and whenever you please, and to let everybody know that I brand the *Deseret News*' published report of said interview as an unprincipled thing and as bearing the indications that characterize the work of unscrupulous men.

Experience of several years among men who have been seeking to bolster up Utah Mormonism has confirmed me in the belief that I was slow to accept at first; viz., that it would require more than an ordinary lifetime to follow up and expose the malicious misrepresentations of the Reorganization that have been created and peddled by advocates of the Utah Church philosophy. It may be possible that in Utah, Elder Spencer's word may be taken in preference to ours; but the all-seeing God of truth knows who are publishing the naked

facts, and to him my testimony is committed, awaiting the judgment hour. Yours for truth,

JOSEPH LUFF.

—*Saints' Herald*, Sept. 14, 1898.

In the *Deseret News* for October 15, 1898, Mr. Spencer seeks to find a conflict between President Smith and Elder Luff, by quoting President Smith as stating,

"The questions were not written in my presence, nor did I see them if written; neither were the answers shown me, nor written in my presence to my knowledge."

He then quotes Elder Luff as writing the following:—

"He pretended to have some questions down in writing and would ask one at a time, then begin writing when an answer was given, and, that, too, without hearing the answer in full!"

To make out his case of conflict Mr. Spencer construes President Smith's words, as given above, to mean that President Smith did not remember that Spencer wrote in his presence, while Elder Luff admits that he did write. It will be observed that President Smith does not say whether he did or did not *write*, but he states that the *answers given in the interview were not written in his presence to his knowledge.*

We leave these statements without further comment that "the unbiased reader" may read and compare.

CHAPTER 11.

BRIGHAM YOUNG—HIS CAREER—WHEREABOUTS OF AUTHORITIES—AUTHORITIES NOT IN HARMONY—TWELVE SUSTAINED—SEASONABLE NOTICE PROMISED — GROWTH OF PRESIDING IDEA—REBAPTISM—REORDINATION—REORGANIZATION—PROMISE OF SEASONABLE NOTICE VIOLATED—CHANGES MADE—WRITTEN WORD DISCARDED—ADAM-GOD—VULGAR TEACHING — CONCERNING DEBTS — EXPERT SCOUNDRELS — BLOOD ATONEMENT—POLYGAMY.

IT may be well now to trace the leading events of the movement under Elder Brigham Young and his associates after June 27, 1844, the date of the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith.

At that time Sidney Rigdon, the only remaining member of the Presidency, was in Pennsylvania; Brigham Young, H. C. Kimball, William Smith, Orson Pratt, Wilford Woodruff, Orson Hyde, and Lyman Wight, of the Twelve, were in the Eastern States; P. P. Pratt was near Utica, New York; J. E. Page was at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania; and G. A. Smith was in Michigan; John Taylor and Willard Richards being the only members of the Twelve at Nauvoo.

The anxiety was great, as the people were unprepared for such an event, and so with much trust did they look forward to the return of these officers, anticipating that they would be able to lead them out of their dilemma.

Parley P. Pratt was, we believe, the first of these absent officers to appear upon the scene. His attitude can be understood from the communication which he claimed to have received, quoted on page 75.

In a few weeks, however, Elder Rigdon and several of the Twelve were in Nauvoo. but the anxiously waiting saints found no union among their officers. Elder Rigdon

made certain claims, not necessary to define here. Elder Brigham Young and others disputed these claims, and a bitter rivalry ensued. Elder Rigdon with the consent of local authorities appointed a meeting for August 8, 1844, to present his claims. The time came and Elder Brigham Young assumed control of the meeting. This meeting resulted in a vote to support the "Twelve in their calling." (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 638.) This seemed innocent enough, and, of course, the majority of the people voted for it, and Rigdon's claims were not placed before the assembly for their vote.

However, in the issue of the *Times and Seasons* for September 2, the very paper in which the minutes of the above meeting were published, the Editor, who was John Taylor, of the Twelve, made a statement in which he does not pretend to quote the language of the resolution, but relates the incident in rather stronger language than the minutes justify. We give the notice here both for present use and future reference:—

> Great excitement prevails throughout the world to know "who shall be the successor of Joseph Smith?"
>
> In reply, we say, be patient, *be patient* a little, till the proper time comes, and we will tell you all. "Great wheels move slow." At present, we can say that a special conference of the church was held in Nauvoo on the 8th ult., and it was carried *without a dissenting voice*, that the "Twelve" should preside over the whole church, and when any alteration in the presidency shall be required, seasonable notice will be given; and the elders abroad, will best exhibit their wisdom to all men, by remaining silent on those things they are ignorant of. Bishops Whitney and Miller have been appointed trustees, to manage the financial concerns of the church, and will soon enter on the duties of their calling.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 632.

Not forgetting this promise of "seasonable notice," let us see how this idea of presiding grew, and how gradually it was introduced to the notice of the people. As we have seen, the Twelve were first sustained "in their calling." Two months later, at the October conference, the Twelve

were presented and sustained separately. In the case of Brigham Young he was sustained as the "President of the Quorum of the Twelve, as one of the Twelve and First Presidency of the church." (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 692.)

At the General Conference of April, 1845, they ventured a little further, and "Elder Phelps moved that this conference accept the Twelve as the First Presidency and leaders of this church. Carried unanimously." (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, p. 869.)

At the October conference of 1845, "Father John Smith, the President of the Stake, then arose and presented the Twelve as the Presidents of the whole church; which was seconded and carried unanimously." (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, p. 1008.)

Thus step by step did they proceed, claiming more and more, until by a succession of events, not necessary to mention here, they found themselves in the Salt Lake Valley, in August, 1847, when strange events took place.

Tullidge, in his "Life of Brigham Young," quotes Mr. Woodruff as follows:—

"On the 6th of August, the Twelve were rebaptized. This we considered a privilege and a duty. As we had come into a glorious valley to locate and build up Zion, we felt like renewing our covenants before the Lord and each other. We soon repaired to the water, and President Young went down into the water and baptized all his brethren of the Twelve present. He then confirmed us, and sealed upon us our apostleship, and all the keys, powers, and blessings belonging to that office. Brother Heber C. Kimball baptized and confirmed President Brigham Young. The following were the names and order of those present: Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Orson Pratt, Willard Richards, Wilford Woodruff, George A. Smith, and Amasa Lyman. Ezra T. Benson had been dispatched several days before to meet the companies on the road.

"In the afternoon of the next day, the Twelve went to the Temple block to select their inheritances. . . .

"During the same evening the Twelve went to City Creek, and Heber C. Kimball baptized fifty-five members of the camp,

for the remission of their sins; and they were confirmed under the hands of President Young, Orson Pratt, Wilford Woodruff, George A. Smith, and Amasa Lyman; President Young being mouth.

"On the next day (Sunday, August 8), the whole camp of Israel renewed their covenants before the Lord by baptism. There were two hundred and twenty-four baptized this morning, making two hundred and eighty-eight rebaptized in the last three days."—Life of Brigham Young, pp. 180–182.

Why should these men who years before had made a covenant with God in baptism and whose hands had baptized hundreds of others be rebaptized? Did they not feel in their own souls that they had broken their covenant? Was not this effort the result of a conviction that they had lost favor with God and a desire to regain his approbation? Mr. Woodruff says: "This we considered a *privilege* and a *duty.*" "We *felt like renewing our covenants* before the Lord and each other."

Under what circumstances is the renewal of a covenant in baptism necessary? We will let Orson Hyde, of their own number, answer:—

When members of our church have become cold and indifferent by the neglect of duty, and have fallen into a lukewarm state, but afterwards cherish a desire to be rebaptized, and covenant anew to keep the commandments of God, it is their right and privilege to confess their sins, humble themselves before God, and do their first work by being immersed in water, and thus their second baptism is no less for the remission or forgiveness of sins than their first; yet to break a solemn covenant by becoming cold, indifferent, or lukewarm, so as to render rebaptism often necessary, is certainly dangerous, for repeated neglect of duty, and the frequent breaking of your covenant, will render you unworthy the protection of God's Spirit, and you will find yourselves caught in the snare of the Devil in some unexpected moment.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 8, p. 136.

If Mr. Hyde was right, these men had broken their covenant. His warning was timely; and, as subsequent events proved, the dire consequences which he pointed out were realized. Subsequently they not only extended the privilege of rebaptism, but enjoined it upon all who came there,

as many can testify, and as the following counsel from Brigham Young, given on October 23, 1853, indicates:—

> I will refer again to the brethren and sisters who have lately come over the plains. My counsel to them to-day is, as it has been on former occasions to all who have come into these valleys, Go and be baptized for the remission of sins, repenting of all your wanderings from the path of righteousness, believing firmly, in the name of Jesus Christ, that all your sins will be washed away. If any of you inquire what is the necessity of your being baptized, as you have not committed any sins, I answer, it is necessary to fulfill all righteousness.—*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 2, p. 89.

If, as Mr. Hyde affirms, the breaking of the covenant necessitates rebaptism, and as Mr. Young affirms, all who came "into these valleys" needed rebaptism, then it follows that in the act of going there and indorsing that institution the covenant made in baptism before going there was broken.

Right here permit us to inform the reader that in the Reorganization baptisms administered by proper authority in the days of Joseph Smith are considered *legal* and *sufficient*. In Utah one having only this baptism would be asked to renew it, thus either throwing discredit upon the former baptism or acknowledging that the former covenant had been broken by their act of accepting the Utah church. Why, then, should we be censured for accepting the logical conclusions of their own teachings; viz., that they are a rejected and covenant-breaking church?

Returning to the strange acts of this band of pioneers in August, 1847, we learn that they not only renewed their baptismal covenant, but that the apostleship conferred upon them under the administration of Joseph Smith was considered inadequate, and the keys and powers by Joseph conferred, of which they now boast so much, were considered insufficient for their purpose. Mr. Woodruff says: "He [Brigham] then confirmed us, and sealed upon us our

apostleship, and all the keys, powers, and blessings belonging to that office."

If anything more is needed to convince one that these men had turned from the church over which Joseph the Martyr presided, follow them back to Winter Quarters on the Missouri River where they arrived October 31, 1847.

Note the following:—

On the 3d of December a conference was held on the east side of the river; but, after having resolved to build immediately a large tabernacle for the congregation, it adjourned for three weeks.

There was a feast and a grand council, December 5, at the house of Elder Hyde, who had been in charge at Winter Quarters during the absence of the pioneers.

In this council of the Twelve Apostles, their President first expressed his views concerning the reorganization of the Quorum of the First Presidency, and wished those present to do the same in their order, when Heber C. Kimball, Orson Pratt, Wilford Woodruff, Willard Richards, George A. Smith, Amasa Lyman, and Ezra T. Benson, spoke to the question. President Young closed.

Orson Hyde then moved that Brigham Young be President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and that he nominate his two councilors to form the First Presidency. Wilford Woodruff seconded the motion, and it was then carried unanimously.

President Young then nominated Heber C. Kimball as his first councilor, and Willard Richards as his second councilor, which was seconded and carried unanimously.—Life of Brigham Young, p. 188.

In this council of the Twelve, December 5, 1847, Brigham Young *first* expressed his views on this movement, then *immediately*, without further *consideration* or *notice*, this council proceeded to elevate three of their number to the Presidency. In this council there were only seven of those who composed the quorum at the death of Joseph Smith; viz., Brigham Young, H. C. Kimball, Willard Richards, Orson Pratt, Orson Hyde, Wilford Woodruff, and G. A. Smith. It is well known that William Smith, Lyman Wight, and John E. Page, had not acted with them for

some time, and were never at Winter Quarters. John Taylor and P. P. Pratt were in Salt Lake Valley. These five were not only absent, but could have known nothing of such a thing being contemplated. So that to get a majority vote of the Twelve, as left by Joseph, to elevate Brigham Young, he must vote for himself. Yes, more; his election *depended* upon his own vote.

Then, too, what becomes of the solemn promise made just after the death of Joseph, when the saints were bidden, "Be patient, *be patient*," under the assurance that "when any alteration in the Presidency shall be required, *seasonable notice will be given*"? (See page 115.)

Nor was this seasonable notice given before this action was presented to and indorsed by the body on December 24, 1847. The only possible time for notice was the nineteen days between December 5 and December 24. So when we consider that this took place on the frontier, where there were neither railroads nor telegraphs within hundreds of miles of the scene of action, we must conclude that the great mass of the church knew nothing of such a move being anticipated.

They claim that there were *one thousand* present. Suppose there were that many, which is very doubtful, that was about one out of every one hundred and fifty composing the church in 1844—*one* representing one hundred and forty-nine others, without the knowledge or consent of those represented, and that too when no intimation had been given of the business to be done. Thus did Brigham Young and his colleagues "*reorganize* the church" as he (Brigham) terms it (see p. 85); and yet Mr. Roberts comes forward and asserts that, "Any organization claiming to be the 'Reorganized church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' is a counterfeit and writes fraud in the very title of it." (See p. 84.)

Again, while Mr. Roberts indorses the above proceed-

ings he files a complaint against the Amboy Conference of 1860, alleging insufficient notice and small attendance (see Roberts, p. 74–5), though the Amboy Conference had six months' notice, the October conference of 1859 having "adjourned to meet at Amboy, Illinois, April 6, 1860" (see *Saints' Herald*, Vol. 1, p. 27), and that too when means of communication were ample to spread the news to every part of the world where saints were found. Surely Mr. Roberts must be thoroughly imbued with the theory that "Orthodoxy, my lord, is *my* doxy; and heterodoxy is some other man's doxy!"

But how did Mr. Young procure the indorsement of so many of the leading men? After that transformation procedure, spoken of in the first chapter of this work, when he found himself in the favor of a large number, and when those whom he could not lead had manifested their independence, he began gradually to remove from office and places of influence all whom he had any reason to fear would oppose him. First, Sidney Rigdon, of the First Presidency, was disposed of; then William Smith, John E. Page, and Lyman Wight, of the Twelve, were either expelled or placed under censure to destroy their influence.

To supply their places Amasa Lyman was presented, together with Sidney Rigdon, as a counselor in the Presidency, and offered the same position to the Twelve. (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 638.) Lyman accepted; Rigdon objected. Rigdon was expelled; Lyman was received as one of the Twelve. (Ibid., p. 692.)

Later (July 6, 1846), Ezra T. Benson was received into the Twelve, but just how he was designated for the position we have not learned.

George Miller, who was called of God to succeed Edward Partridge as Presiding Bishop (Doctrine and Covenants 107: 8), was relegated to second place and N. K. Whitney placed over him. (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 693.)

William Marks was removed from his position as President of the Stake of Nauvoo, and John Smith installed in his place. (Ibid., p. 692.) Elder Marks was also removed as President of the High Council, and was succeeded by Samuel Bent. (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, p. 870.)

Josiah Butterfield, of the Presidents of Seventy, was cut off the church (no reason stated for the act) and Jedediah M. Grant chosen to succeed him. (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 693.)

Lyman Wight and John Snider were removed from the Nauvoo House building committee, and Amasa Lyman and George A. Smith put in their places. (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 6, p. 91.)

Several changes were made in the High Council.

Nine extra quorums of Seventy were created; a part of them at least were the nominees of Brigham Young. (See p. 94.)

Several were expelled from the church without trial, and without a statement of the cause being given. (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 687.) Some were suspended without labor or trial for voting for Elder Rigdon, and some even suspended on *anticipated* acts of displeasure. (Ibid., p. 686.)

These and other changes too numerous to mention reveal that the tendency was to place men in positions of trust who could be relied upon to obey counsel regardless of the teaching of the law.

As early as September, 1844, when Elder William Marks in his defense of Elder Rigdon appealed to the written word, Elder Brigham Young replied and in that reply said:—

> If this people have no evidence but the written word, it is quite time to go to the river and be baptized, etc.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 666.
>
> As to a person not knowing more than the written word, let me tell you that there are keys that the written word never spoke of, nor never will.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 667.

This was early paving the way to teach that which the word of God did not contain.

In harmony with this thought Elder Brigham Young said on April 6, 1845:—

> Joseph in his lifetime did not receive everything connected with the doctrine of redemption, but he has left the key with those who understand how to obtain and teach to this great people all that is necessary for their salvation and exaltation in the celestial kingdom of our God.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, p. 955.

This was preparing the way for the introduction of principles which Joseph had not taught. Many like passages can be produced from their record all through the years until now, of teachings which had a tendency, if believed, to train the people to obey counsel and follow their leaders without asking whether Joseph taught it or not, or whether it was taught in the word of God. This led to the condition of things described by Brigham Young on September 11, 1853:—

> If I have any knowledge touching the condition of this people at the present time, and the way they are taught, led, counseled, and dictated by those who go before them to open up the way, it is directly opposite of that we saw in the days of Joseph the Prophet.—*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 1, p. 78.

Mr. Young may have intended that these words should have a very limited application, but the tendency of his teaching was to bring about a general condition of departure from original principles. This made it easy for him to introduce doctrines and principles not taught under Joseph Smith's administration, nor in the word of God. Some of these departures we will notice briefly, as the space designed for this work will not admit of an extended examination.

Nowhere in the standard books of the church or in the teachings of Joseph Smith can anything like the following from Brigham Young be found:—

> Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile,

Saint and sinner! When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a *celestial body*, and brought Eve, *one of his wives*, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is MICHAEL, *the Archangel*, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! about whom holy men have written and spoken—HE *is our* FATHER *and our* GOD, *and the only God with whom* WE *have to do.—Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 1, p. 50.

Here is another illustration of where a departure from the written word led Mr. Young and those who sustained him:—

I have given you a few leading items upon this subject, but a great deal more remains to be told. Now, remember from this time forth, and forever, that Jesus Christ was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. I will repeat a little anecdote. I was in conversation with a certain learned professor upon this subject, when I replied, to this idea—"if the Son was begotten by the Holy Ghost, it would be very dangerous to baptize and confirm females, and give the Holy Ghost to them, lest he should beget children, to be palmed upon the Elders by the people, bringing the Elders into great difficulties.—*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 1, p. 51.

We feel to apologize to our readers for even quoting that which approaches so nearly upon the vulgar and obscene; but the depths of degradation and shame to which this departure from God's word led this man can only be realized by letting him speak for himself.

Contrast the above with the word of God:—

Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.—Matt. 1: 18.

Reader, will you follow the leadership of a man who holds the keys by which such filthy and disgusting things are revealed, and thus place yourself in opposition to the word of God?

Here is another rich treasure brought to light by this holder of special keys:—

I wish to impress another thing upon your minds. An Elder, who is willing to preach the Gospel, borrows a hundred or a thousand dollars from you, and you never breathe the first com-

plaint against him, until you came home to this valley, but after you have been here for a few days, you follow me round and fill my ears with complaints against this brother, and ask me what he has done with your money? I say, "I do not know." Thus you are distressed and in misery, all the day long, to get it back again. If an Elder has borrowed from you, and you find he is going to apostatize, then you may tighten the screws upon him; but if he is willing to preach the Gospel, without purse or scrip, it is none of your business what he does with the money he has borrowed from you.—*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 1, p. 340.

Surely there is nothing in the written word nor in the teachings of Joseph Smith like this.

Another specimen:—

I have many a time, in this stand, dared the world to produce as mean devils as we can. We can beat them at anything. We have the *greatest and smoothest liars* in the world, the *cunningest and most adroit thieves*, and any other shade of character that you can mention.

We can pick out elders in Israel right here who can beat the world at gambling; who can handle the cards; can cut and shuffle them with the smartest rogue on God's footstool. I can produce elders here who can shave their smartest shavers, and take their money from them. We can beat the world at any game.—*Deseret News*, Vol. 6, p. 291; *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 4, p. 77.

We can hardly believe that Mr. Young intended to indorse all this rascality and corruption, and yet the reason which he assigns for this deplorable state of affairs seems to commit him to an indorsement.

Here it is:—

We can beat them because we have men here that *live in the light of the Lord; that have the holy* priesthood, and hold the keys of the kingdom of God. But you may go through all the sectarian world, and you cannot find a man capable of opening the door of the kingdom of God to admit others in. We can do that. We can pray the best, preach the best, and sing the best. We are the best looking and finest set of people on the face of the earth; and they can begin any game they please, and we are on hand, and can beat them at anything they have a mind to begin. They may make sharp their two-edged swords, and I will turn out the elders of Israel with greased feathers, and whip them to death. We are not to be beat. We

expect to be a stumbling block to the whole world, and a rock of offence to them.—*Deseret News*, Vol. 6, p. 291; *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 4, p. 77.

It would be idle to dispute the claim of Brigham Young that he held "keys that the written word never spoke of, nor never will." But whence came they? From heaven, or from beneath—from God, or from Satan?

Let Moroni answer:—

Wherefore, all things which are good, cometh of God; and that which is evil, cometh of the devil; for the devil is an enemy unto God, and fighteth against him continually, and inviteth and enticeth to sin, and to do that which is evil continually. But behold, that which is of God, inviteth and enticeth to do good continually; wherefore, every thing which inviteth and enticeth to do good, and to love God, and to serve him, is inspired of God. Wherefore take heed, my beloved brethren, that ye do not judge that which is evil to be of God, or that which is good and of God, to be of the devil. For behold, my brethren, it is given unto you to judge, that ye may know good from evil; and the way to judge is as plain, that ye may know with a perfect knowledge, as the daylight is from the dark night. For behold, the Spirit of Christ is given to every man, that they may know good from evil; wherefore I shew unto you the way to judge: for every thing which inviteth to do good, and to persuade to believe in Christ, is sent forth by the power and gift of Christ; wherefore ye may know with a perfect knowledge, it is of God; but whatsoever thing persuadeth men to do evil, and believe not in Christ, and deny him, and serve not God, then ye may know with a perfect knowledge it is of the devil, for after this manner doth the devil work, for he persuadeth no man to do good, no not one; neither doth his angels; neither do they who subject themselves unto him.—Book of Mormon, Moroni 7:2.

Let us apply the above test to some other items of the teaching of Elder Young and his colleagues. Here is something that, had it been reported of them by their enemies, we could not have given credence to; but it is found in their own publications:—

All mankind love themselves; and let these principles be known by an individual, and he would be glad to have his blood shed. That would be loving themselves even unto an eternal exaltation. Will you love your brothers and sisters, likewise, when they have committed a sin that cannot be atoned for with-

out the shedding of blood? Will you love that man or woman well enough to shed their blood? That is what Jesus Christ meant. He never told a man or woman to love their enemies in their wickedness. He never intended any such thing. . . . I have known a great many men who have left this church, for whom there is no chance whatever for exaltation; but if their blood had been spilled, it would have been better for them. The wickedness and ignorance of the nations forbid this principle being in full force; but the time will come when the law of God will be in full force.

This is loving our neighbor as ourselves; if he needs help, help him; and if he wants salvation, and it is necessary to spill his blood upon the ground in order that he may be saved, spill it. Any of you who understand the principles of eternity, if you have sinned a sin requiring the shedding of blood, except the sin unto death, would not be satisfied nor rest until your blood should be spilled, that you might gain that salvation you desire. That is the way to love mankind.—*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 4, p. 220; *Deseret News*, Vol. 6, p. 397.

The above is the language of Brigham Young; the following the language of Jedediah M. Grant, his counselor:—

I say there are men and women here that I would advise to go to the president immediately, and ask him to appoint a committee to attend to their case; and then let a place be selected, and let that committee shed their blood.—*Deseret News*, Vol. 6, p. 235.

Efforts have been made of late years to explain this language away by making it appear that it only had reference to those who should be executed for crime by the laws of the land. If this is what Brigham intended, what did he mean by "The wickedness and ignorance of the nations forbid this principle being in full force," etc.? Surely he had reference to something which now the law of the land forbids. What did Jedediah M. Grant mean by advising that certain parties "go to the president *immediately*, and ask him to appoint a committee to attend to their case"?

To occupy more space upon this point is unnecessary. The reader can readily see that this language cannot be explained away; and that Messrs. Young and Grant intended to justify individuals in taking the lives of others,

thus encouraging murder; and that too in the name of God and religion. We do not wonder that the advocates of the Utah system blush with shame to meet this, and would gladly close their eyes to the purport of these words of their leaders so full of darkness and horror. Oh, had the keys that unlocked these things been lost, in how much better condition would latter-day Israel be to-day! Oh, tell us not that the anointed successor of Joseph the Seer should have been ordained under such hands, and by such polluted lips!

Much more of this character could be produced from their own records, but we will invite attention to but one more principle into which the people of Utah were led by the deceptive theory that their leaders possessed keys to unlock things never known to Joseph or the written word.

On August 29, 1852, at a Special Conference held in Salt Lake City, Utah, the doctrine of polygamy or plurality of wives was first introduced to the church for indorsement. That it had been practiced to some extent prior to this is evident. By whom, or how many, is immaterial; for our conduct should not be governed by the acts of men, but by the principles of truth. The existence of this practice had been both admitted and denied by those who were in a position to know, until it is very difficult to locate the responsibility for this departure from the law of God; nor is this the purpose of this treatise.

But one point is admitted by all; viz.: that the church as a body was never asked to indorse plural marriage before August 29, 1852. The responsibility of the body began with that date, and Brigham Young was the responsible party for its introduction. No matter who may or who may not have practiced it privately, it is legitimate to hold Mr. Young responsible for introducing it to the public as a tenet of faith.

It is not our purpose in this work to discuss polygamy.

It is well known that the Reorganization is and ever has been uncompromisingly opposed to it; and the ministry everywhere is well prepared to meet the advocates of this pernicious innovation. We present it here as another item of doctrine given to the church by these boastful keyholders, and which was not presented to the church in the days of Joseph Smith.

As evidence of this we cite the following from their own men:—

G. Q. Cannon, in a sermon, June 11, 1871, *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 14, pp. 165, 166, says:—

"A prevalent idea has been that this prejudice against us owes its origin and continuation to our belief in a plurality of wives. . . . Joseph and Hyrum Smith were slain in Carthage jail, and hundreds of persons were persecuted to death previous to the church having any knowledge of this doctrine."

H. B. Clawson says of the time they were driven from Nauvoo:—

"Polygamy at that time was unknown among those of the Mormon faith. . . . The doctrine of polygamy was not promulgated until they got to Salt Lake; not, in fact, until some little time after they arrived there." (See *Salt Lake Herald*, February 9, 1882.)

Being interviewed by United States Senator Trumbull, in 1869, Brigham Young said:—

"As to our institutions, we know we are right, and polygamy, which you object to, was not originally a part of our system, but was adopted by us as a necessity, after we came here."—*Alta Californian.*

. . . . . .

The *Deseret News* of December 11, 1881, or December 7, 1882, says:—

"The 'Mormon' church existed for many years without polygamy. Indeed, correctly speaking, polygamy is not now and never has been even a tenet of the 'Mormon' faith."—"Books and Utah Mormonism in Contrast," pp. 22, 23.

We present further that the prophecy uttered by Brigham Young in August, 1852, has utterly failed.

Here is what he said:—

You heard Brother Pratt state, this morning, that a Revelation would be read this afternoon, which was given previous to Joseph's death. It contains a doctrine, a small portion of the

world is opposed to; but I can deliver a prophecy upon it. Though that doctrine has not been practiced by the Elders, this people have believed in it for years. . . .

The Revelation will be read to you. The principle spoken upon by Brother Pratt, this morning, we believe in. And I tell you—for I know it—it will sail over, and ride triumphantly above all the prejudice and priestcraft of the day; it will be fostered and believed in by the more intelligent portions of the world, as one of the best doctrines ever proclaimed to any people. Your hearts need not beat; you need not think that a mob is coming here to tread upon the sacred liberty which the Constitution of our country guarantees unto us, for it will not be.—Supplement to *Millennial Star*, 1853 (Vol. 15), p. 31.

The people who accepted this principle, and the sentiment expressed above, maintained their position for years as best they could against an overwhelming and ever increasing conviction and sentiment against it. Instead of its riding "triumphantly above all the prejudice," etc., it was evident from the first, to all but the Brighamites, that its doom was sealed, and that the failure of those who advocated it was but a question of time. Laws were enacted against it, men were fined, imprisoned, disfranchised, and exiled; and yet they held out, contending that it was a part of their faith and that they could not abandon it without renouncing that faith. As late as the 15th of April, 1889, Mr. George Teasdale, then as now one of their Twelve Apostles, published editorially the following:—

The assault against the church is made on the line of the marriage question because it seems to offer at present the greatest prospect for the success of hostile effort. The saints in general are less firmly united on this principle than on many others belonging to the gospel, and it is hoped by our enemies that this circumstance will conduce largely, if not successfully, to bring about its renunciation by the people in a church capacity. Such an act would be tantamount to an apostasy, and the consequent destruction of the power and authority of the priesthood would be consummated. This is the great object aimed at.—*Millennial Star*, Vol 51, pp. 232, 233.

The very next year, 1890, President Woodruff issued a

manifesto forbidding the solemnization of any more plural marriages. This was adopted in "church capacity," and so according to Mr. Teasdale they committed an act tantamount to apostasy and the destruction of the power and authority of their priesthood was consummated. And that is the way it triumphed!

Mr. Young has been proved a false prophet; and the institution he founded is tottering to its fall. In the language of Mr. Roberts, "It is only a question of time with regard to its failure. MENE, MENE, TEKEL, is written upon its walls—God hath numbered thy kingdom—weighed in the balances—found wanting!"

In rejecting the family which God has chosen, the followers of Elder Young have repeated the mistake of ancient Israel, and they might with great profit read and be admonished by the following:—

Thus saith the Lord; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured; so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me. Moreover the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying, Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, The two families which the Lord hath chosen, he hath even cast them off? thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them. Thus saith the Lord; If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them.—Jeremiah 33:20–26

CHAPTER 12.

POINTS ESTABLISHED — RELEVANT QUESTION — ACKNOWLEDGED PEOPLE OF GOD—AUTHORITY TO CHOOSE AND ORDAIN—TEACHING OF JOSEPH SMITH'S SUCCESSOR—CONCLUSION.

IN the foregoing pages we have established the following points:—

1. That the blessing of Joseph Smith the Prophet belongs to his posterity, according to the law of lineage.

2. That this blessing includes the right to the keys of the kingdom.

3. That these keys belong always to the Presidency of the High Priesthood; hence the posterity of Joseph should preside over the high priesthood.

4. That Joseph, the eldest son of Joseph the Seer, was blessed, set apart, and appointed by his father to succeed him.

5. That the authority to appoint his successor was vested in Joseph Smith by virtue of the position he held.

The only relevant question remaining to be solved is this: Did Joseph Smith, the son of the Prophet, pursue the proper course in proceeding to occupy in the sacred office to which he had been called and appointed?

1. Were the people with whom he identified himself the acknowledged people of God?

2. Did they have authority to choose and ordain him?

3. Has his subsequent teaching given evidence that he is the true successor of Joseph Smith his father?

On the first question, *Were the people with whom he identified himself the acknowledged people of God?* We present as evidence that when he the anointed and appointed of God went humbly to the Lord, he was directed to the "saints

reorganizing at Zarahemla and other places." (See p. 57.)

We invite attention also to the position occupied by that people; viz.: They recognized the true situation—that the church had been rejected, and that a reorganization was essential; they took a position in harmony with the law and the promises of God in regard to succession, as we have clearly shown in these pages.

Further, they adhered to the law of God as found in the *written word*, and were not led into abominable and immoral practices by the delusive theory that God had bestowed upon men "keys that the written word never spoke of."

The following is a part of their declaration as adopted by the June conference of 1852:—

Resolved, that as the office of First President of the Church grows out of the authority of the Presiding High Priest in the high priesthood, no person can legally lay claim to the office of First President of the Church, without a previous ordination to the Presidency of the High Priesthood.

Resolved, that we recognize the validity of all legal ordinations in this church, and will fellowship all such as have thus been ordained, while acting within the purview of such authority.

Resolved, that we believe that the Church of Christ, organized on the 6th day of April, A. D. 1830, exists as on that day wherever six or more saints are organized according to the pattern in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants.

Resolved, that the whole law of the Church of Jesus Christ is contained in the Bible, Book of Mormon, and Book of Doctrine and Covenants.—*The Messenger*, Vol. 2, p. 9.

This last resolution harmonizes with the law which says:—

Hearken and hear, O ye my people, saith the Lord and your God, ye whom I delight to bless with the greatest blessings; ye that hear me: and ye that hear me not will I curse, that have professed my name, with the heaviest of all cursings. Hearken, O ye elders of my church whom I have called: behold, I give unto you a commandment, that ye shall assemble yourselves together to agree upon my word, and by the prayer of your faith ye shall receive my law, that ye may know how to govern my church, and have all things right before me.

And I will be your Ruler when I come; and, behold, I come

quickly; and ye shall see that my law is kept. He that receiveth my law and doeth it the same is my disciple; and he that saith he receiveth it and doeth it not, the same is not my disciple, and shall be cast out from among you; for it is not meet that the things which belong to the children of the kingdom, should be given to them that are not worthy, or to dogs, or the pearls to be cast before swine.

. . . These words are given unto you, and they are pure before me; wherefore, beware how you hold them, for they are to be answered upon your souls in the day of judgment. Even so. Amen.—D. C. 41: 1, 2, 3.

Section 42 indicates that they had assembled together and that the promised law by which they were "to govern my church and have all things right before me [God]," was to be given them.

A part of that law reads as follows:—

And again, the elders, priests, and teachers of this church shall teach the principles of my gospel which are in the Bible and the Book of Mormon, in the which is the fullness of the gospel; and they shall observe the covenants and church articles to do them; and these shall be their teachings, as they shall be directed by the Spirit; and the Spirit shall be given unto you by the prayer of faith, and if ye receive not the Spirit ye shall not teach. And all this ye shall observe to do as I have commanded concerning your teaching, until the fullness of my scriptures are given. And as ye shall lift up your voices by the Comforter, ye shall speak and prophesy as seemeth me good; for, behold, the Comforter knoweth all things, and beareth record of the Father and of the Son.—D. C. 42:5.

To this the Reorganization committed itself. The Utah people were induced by their leaders to adopt strange and questionable things not taught by Joseph nor found in the written word, under the delusive impression that their boasted keyholders were unlocking the treasure-house and handing out celestial gems.

Again, the instruction given to Jason W. Briggs on November 18, 1851, which was one of the influences leading to the Reorganization, was in harmony with the foregoing. The following is an extract therefrom:—

Therefore, let the Elders whom I have ordained by the hand

of my servant Joseph, or by the hand of those ordained by him, resist not this authority, nor faint in the discharge of duty, which is to preach my gospel as revealed in the record of the Jews, and the Book of Mormon, and the Book of Doctrine and and Covenants; and cry repentance and remission of sins through obedience to the gospel, and I will sustain them, and give them my Spirit; and in mine own due time will I call upon the seed of Joseph Smith, and will bring one forth, and he shall be mighty and strong, and he shall preside over the high priesthood of my church; and then shall the quorums assemble, and the pure in heart shall gather, and Zion shall be reinhabited, as I said unto my servant Joseph Smith;—after many days shall all these things be accomplished, saith the Spirit.—*The Messenger*, Vol. 2, p. 1.

This leads us to something else. The reinhabiting of Zion and the words of the Lord to Joseph Smith in connection therewith are referred to—"After many days shall all these things be accomplished." Where in the revelations to Joseph Smith do we find this sentiment? In a revelation given December, 1833.

It is important. We quote as follows:—

And now, I will show unto you a parable that you may know my will concerning the redemption of Zion. A certain nobleman had a spot of land, very choice; and he said unto his servants, Go ye into my vineyard, even upon this very choice piece of land, and plant twelve olive trees; and set watchmen round about them and build a tower, that one may overlook the land round about, to be a watchman upon the tower; that mine olive trees may not be broken down, when the enemy shall come to spoil and take unto themselves the fruit of my vineyard. Now the servants of the nobleman went and did as their lord commanded them; and planted the olive trees, and built a hedge round about, and set watchmen, and began to build a tower. And while they were yet laying the foundation thereof, they began to say among themselves, And what need hath my lord of this tower? and consulted for a long time, saying among themselves, What need hath my lord of this tower, seeing this is a time of peace? Might not this money be given to the exchangers? for there is no need of these things! And while they were at variance one with another they became very slothful, and they hearkened not unto the commandments of their lord, and the enemy came by night and broke down the hedge, and the servants of the nobleman arose, and were affrighted, and fled; and the enemy destroyed their works and broke down the olive trees.

Now, behold, the nobleman, the lord of the vineyard, called upon his servants, and said unto them, Why! what is the cause of this great evil? ought ye not to have done even as I commanded you? and after ye had planted the vineyard, and built the hedge round about, and set watchmen upon the walls thereof, built the tower also, and set a watchman upon the tower, and watched for my vineyard, and not have fallen asleep, lest the enemy should come upon you? and, behold, the watchman upon the tower would have seen the enemy while he was yet afar off, and then you could have made ready and kept the enemy from breaking down the hedge thereof, and saved my vineyard from the hands of the destroyer. And the lord of the vineyard said unto one of his servants, Go and gather together the residue of my servants; and take all the strength of mine house, which are my warriors, my young men, and they that are of middle age also, among all my servants, who are the strength of mine house, save those only whom I have appointed to tarry; and go ye straightway unto the land of my vineyard, and redeem my vineyard, for it is mine, I have bought it with money. Therefore, get ye straightway unto my land; break down the walls of mine enemies, throw down their tower, and scatter their watchmen; and inasmuch as they gather together against you, avenge me of mine enemies; that by and by I may come with the residue of mine house and possess the land.

And the servant said unto his lord, When shall these things be? And he said unto his servant, When I will: go ye straightway: and do all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and this shall be my seal and blessing upon you; a faithful and wise steward in the midst of mine house; a ruler in my kingdom. And his servant went straightway, and did all things whatsoever his lord commanded him, and after many days all things were fulfilled.—Doc. and Cov. 98: 6–8.

Without occupying space to discuss all the minor points in the above parable we invite attention to the following leading points:—

1. The subject of the parable is the redemption of Zion.

2. The servants of the nobleman (the people of God) were to be directed to occupy a choice piece of land.

3. They were to do as they were commanded.

4. While they were yet laying the foundation they were to get at variance one with another and become slothful.

5. As a result of this unfaithfulness their enemies were to come upon them and destroy their works.

6. They were to become affrighted and flee.

7. The nobleman (God) was to remonstrate with them for their unfaithfulness and to hold them responsible for allowing his vineyard to be destroyed.

8. Then he was to call upon *one* of his servants to gather together the *residue* of his servants (not the body which had fled).

9. This servant at the head of this residue was to go straightway into the vineyard and redeem it, break down the walls of the enemy, throw down their tower, scatter their watchmen, etc.

10. This servant was to inquire when these things should be, but was simply to be told, "*When I will.*"

11. He was told that if he performed his part he should be a faithful and wise steward and a ruler in the kingdom.

12. He was to do whatsoever he was commanded and *after many days* all things (concerning the redemption of Zion) were to be fulfilled.

The revelation to Elder Briggs connects this latter point with the work of the Reorganization.

We are aware that it has been understood that this revelation of December, 1833, applied to the work of "Zion's Camp" which went up the next year to Missouri to relieve their brethren. That the participants in that movement should hope and expect to fulfill it, is quite natural; and that it may in a sense have had reference to that movement, we admit. But it did not have a complete fulfillment then. The Camp of Zion was not composed of the residue left after the church fled from Jackson County, in 1833. Zion's Camp did not scatter the enemy, but were themselves disbanded ere they reached the land whence their brethren had been driven. However, there came a time, as has been made apparent in the preceding pages,

when the church became slothful and failed to do the work commanded within the time appointed; when their enemies came upon them and they became affrighted and fled, not simply to another part of the choice vineyard, as in the case of former moves, but entirely outside of the appointed Zion. Since the body has fled, one of God's servants has been sent to gather together the "residue," or remnants left behind; and they have gone straightway into the waste places of Zion and are redeeming them; are breaking down the wall, throwing down the tower, and scattering the watchmen of the enemy; not by use of carnal weapons, but by fearlessly defending the faith against opposition; by consistent honorable lives, and square dealing; and by adhering to "*the code of good morals*," taught in the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the Doctrine and Covenants, and to which President Smith pledged himself on that memorable April day of 1860.

This has disarmed the enemy, and the Reorganization is realizing, in a measure, the fulfillment of the promise that the church should find "favor and grace" in the eyes of the people. (See pp. 99, 100.)

Mark it well, this servant who was to be sent to lead this movement was not only to be "a faithful and wise steward" in the midst of God's house, but he was to be "a *ruler* in my [God's] kingdom."

In this connection observe the fitness of the following words of this servant of God as he called upon Latter Day Israel to renew their allegiance:—

> In the name of the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, I now call upon all the scattered saints, upon all the broad earth, to arise and shake off the sleep that hath bound them these many years, take on the armor of the just, calling on the name of the Lord for help, and unite once more for the emancipation of the honest in heart from the power of false doctrines and the shackles of sin.
>
> In the name of bleeding Zion, I call upon all those who have been wandering in by and forbidden paths, and have been led

astray by wicked and designing men, to turn from their scenes of wickedness and sins of convenience—to turn from their servitude to Satan, in all his seductive devices; from vice in every phase, and from the labor of sin, the wages whereof are ever death—unto their true and delightsome allegiance to the principles of the gospel of peace—to the paths of wisdom—to the homage of that God that brought the children of Israel out of bondage; to turn and remember the new covenant, even the Book of Mormon; to lay hold anew upon the rod of iron which surely leads to the tree of life; to remember that those who live to the Lord keep his commandments, and that the promises are unto the faithful, and the reward unto those that endure unto the end.

And in the name of the Lord of Hosts, I call upon all the inhabitants of the earth to repent, believe and be baptized, for the time cometh when the judgments of God are to be poured out upon all nations, and the besom of God's wrath shall smoke through the land; when men shall know that there is a God in Israel, and he is mighty to punish or to save; that the prayers of those under the altar have been heard, and a swift retribution is to come, when the despoiler will be despoiled; when those who denied justice shall be judged, and the measure meted unto others shall be meted unto them; when the prisoner shall go free, the oppressed be redeemed, and all Israel shall cry, "Glory to God in the highest be given, for he that is longsuffering and slow to anger, has arisen, and shall bring again Zion." Amen and amen.

JOSEPH SMITH, President,
Of Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.
NAUVOO, Illinois, July 19, 1861.

—*Saints' Herald*, Vol. 2, pp. 123, 124.

As further evidence that God has accepted the Reorganization, we invite attention to God's promise concerning the Holy Scriptures as translated and corrected by Joseph Smith the Prophet.

Thou shalt ask, and my scriptures shall be given as I have appointed, and they shall be preserved in safety; and it is expedient that thou shouldst hold thy peace concerning them, and not teach them until ye have received them in full. And I give unto you a commandment, that then ye shall teach them unto all men; for they shall be taught unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people.—D. C. 42: 15.

The manuscript of the Holy Scriptures was carefully preserved in the hands of Emma Smith, whom the Brig-

hamites brand as an apostate, and was by her delivered into the hands of the Reorganization, whose exclusive property it is to-day. Then according to God's decree the place of *safety* for that which he would preserve is with the Reorganized Church, and not with the church in Utah.

Then indeed were the people with whom the son of the Prophet identified himself the acknowledged people of God.

Second: *Did they have authority to choose and ordain him?* So far as the choosing is concerned, the foregoing evidence that this people were accepted of God as his church, is sufficient; but on the subject of ordination, and the question as to whether there was authority among those composing the Reorganization to ordain, we offer a few observations.

We agree with Mr. Roberts that an ordination was necessary. Then to whom should this man, called and appointed of God, go to receive his ordination? To a rebaptized, a reordained apostleship? To men who claimed to lead the church by virtue of "keys that the written word never spoke of, nor never will"? To men who were led by such keys into the idolatrous doctrine of worshiping Adam as God, and denying the Scriptures concerning the birth of Jesus Christ? To men who taught the repudiation of honest debts, justified and advised murder, and taught that the priesthood of God gave power to men to become expert thieves, gamblers, and rogues? To men who had themselves usurped the authority to preside without an ordination of any kind to that position? To men who by deceit and fraud had fastened the practice of polygamy upon the credulous? To men who were the acknowledged representatives of a rejected and covenant breaking people? O no! certainly not. God would not send his chosen prophet to receive ordination from such a source.

Then to whom should he go? When, because of apostasy and spiritual darkness, God had rejected the once Christian Church, and he desired to again establish his church on earth, he gave direction how to organize, and provided among other things for the selection of a Quorum of Twelve Apostles. What provision did he make for this? A committee was appointed by revelation, consisting of Oliver Cowdery and David Whitmer (D. C. 16: 6), to which Martin Harris was subsequently added, and to them the Lord gave authority to select the Twelve according to specific instruction given. In 1835 the Twelve were selected by these men. Neither of the three, though they were in a general sense *Apostles*, were ever members of the Quorum of Twelve; and though they did not then nor thereafter hold any office equal to it, yet they ordained these men Apostles of the Quorum of Twelve and gave them their charge.

To this Quorum of Twelve thus chosen and ordained God delegated the authority "to ordain and set in order all the other officers of the church." (D. C. 104: 30.)

When the quorum thus appointed so far departed from the law of God as to suffer themselves to be rebaptized and reordained by one who was openly acting by the authority of "keys that the written word never spoke of, nor never will," and by the authority and dictation of this same man were led into the abominations we have referred to, thus proving themselves unworthy to act in the sacred office to which they had been previously called,—when they no longer represented a people governed by the word of God, but a rejected and covenant-breaking people,—how would we expect God to renew the apostolic authority, how reorganize the apostolic quorum, and restore the authority to ordain and set in order? We would, of course, expect him to be consistent with himself, and another quorum would be chosen in like manner as the first was chosen.

In this the instruction given to the Reorganization was consistent. It was as follows:—

> Verily, thus saith the Lord, as I said unto my servant Moses, see thou do all things according to the pattern, so say I unto you. Behold the pattern is before you. It is my will that you respect authority in my church; therefore let the greatest among you preside at your conference. Let three men be appointed by the conference to select seven men from among you, who shall compose a majority of the twelve apostles; for it is my will that that quorum should not be filled up at present.—*The Messenger*, Vol. 2, p. 21.

Members of this quorum were chosen exactly as were the quorum installed in 1835, and were ordained by those holding authority in the days of Joseph Smith, and who occupied positions in the priesthood as high as did Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, or Martin Harris. Men from this quorum thus chosen and ordained according to the pattern, officiated at the ordination of President Joseph Smith in April, 1860.

No wonder that Mr. Roberts could find no valid objection to this authority, but could only say in a bombastic manner:—

> Now, I affirm that among all those seven men who were "called" to form the majority of the quorum of the twelve, in the "Reorganization" not one of them held the apostleship; that they could not give what they did not possess; that therefore neither the seven men called to be apostles, in April, 1853, received the apostleship, nor any whom they subsequently ordained.—Roberts, p. 77.

Then, as if to make assurance doubly sure, Elder William Marks who was President of the High Council at the seat of the Presidency, and President of the Nauvoo stake at the time of Joseph's death, and whom the Lord had said he would raise up as a "blessing unto many people" (see p. 84), assisted in that ordination.

In this connection it will be well to remember that William Marks as a *high priest* held the same authority that was held by those who ordained Joseph the Martyr as

President of the High Priesthood, as the following will show:—

"On the 26th I called a general council of the church, and was acknowledged as the president of the high priesthood, according to a previous ordination at a conference of high priests, elders, and members, held at Amherst, Ohio, on the twenty-fifth of January, 1832. The right hand of fellowship was given to me by the bishop, Edward Partridge, in behalf of the church. The scene was solemn, impressive, and delightful. During the intermission, a difficulty or hardness which had existed between Bishop Partridge and Elder Rigdon was amicably settled, and when we came together in the afternoon, all hearts seemed to rejoice."—Church History, Vol. 1, p. 244; *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 624.

This was before there was a Quorum of Twelve Apostles.

Thus does it appear that President Joseph Smith and his father were ordained by the same authority; viz.: by those holding the office of high priest; and in addition to this, President Smith's ordination was participated in by those who were regularly called and ordained to the office of apostle.

Notwithstanding all this, Messrs. Roberts, Penrose, and their associates will scoff at the authority of this ordination; while they indorse the presidency of Brigham Young, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, and Lorenzo Snow, not one of whom have ever claimed an ordination of any kind or by any authority to the office of President of the High Priesthood.

"O consistency thou art a jewel;" but thy home is not in Utah.

In answer to this conclusive presentation of the case they can only call William Marks hard names, and *affirm* that the apostles of the Reorganization had no authority.

While there are *general* rules for the church to be governed by, yet so far as authority is concerned, the command of God is authority for anything. By virtue of his command authority is bestowed; yet we expect him to act

consistently with himself, as in the selection of the Quorum of Twelve in 1835, and in the Reorganization.

But our friends say that the lesser ordaining the greater is "contrary to the order and contrary to nature—a stream cannot rise above its source."

If their reasoning was good it would condemn the apostolic ordinations performed in 1835; the ordination of Joseph the Martyr by high priests in 1832; and, strange to say, that what they condemn they ask "young Joseph" to accept, claiming that he should have had his ordination to a position in the *first* quorum (the First Presidency) under the hands of those whom they claim retained their authority as members of the *second* quorum (the Twelve).

That a stream cannot rise above its fountain or source, is true; but it is also true that a stream cannot sink so low that it may not rise again to any height not exceeding that of its source. Those who employ this analogy and compare the priesthood to a stream of water, make the mistake of locating the source of the stream of priesthood in the man who ordains, or in the office that he holds.

This is manifestly wrong. The source of the priesthood is in God; and so long as the source retains its strength, though the stream may flow through lower channels at times, such stream may rise to any height not exceeding that of its source—God himself. The danger lies not in the channel being low, but in its becoming unclean and unworthy to contain the pure waters of life. In such a case the Intelligent Source of the stream of priesthood would withdraw the waters and leave the channel dry, or but a refuge for filth and uncleanness.

The language of Joseph Smith and his companions in bonds, written from Liberty Jail, Missouri, in 1839, is significant, and in this connection we commend their words to careful consideration:—

There are many called but few are chosen, and why are they

not chosen? Because their hearts are set upon the things of the world, and are aspiring to the honors of men; they do not learn the lesson that the rights of the priesthood are inseparably connected with the powers of heaven; and that the powers of heaven cannot be controlled nor handled, only upon the principles of righteousness. That they may be conferred upon us, it is true; but when we undertake to cover our sins, to gratify our pride, vain ambition, or to exercise dominion or compulsion over the souls of the children of men, in any degree of unrighteousness; behold the heavens withdraw themselves, the Spirit of the Lord is grieved, then amen to the priesthood, or to the authority of that man; behold ere he is aware, he is left to kick against the pricks; to persecute the saints, and to fight against God.—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 1, pp. 131, 132.

This is a serious consideration. Too often men have been lifted up in pride and boasted of their high prerogatives, while they have paid too little attention to purity of life and meekness of spirit. That is indeed a sad condition of things when men high in authority use that authority as a license for uncleanness, or as a cloak to cover corruption. And when men boast of acting by virtue of keys or authority that the "written word never spoke of, nor never will," they are like a vessel at sea without a rudder; they will drift upon the rocks and be wrecked. Adam-God, blood atonement, polygamy, and other theories and crimes, fostered and encouraged by Brigham Young and others, are but the legitimate results of this peculiar *key* doctrine, and of considering the office a man holds of more importance than the purity and righteousness of his life.

Christ in his extreme trial appealed to what was written. Should his servants fail to do so, they will not represent him, but *mis*represent him.

Those who use the stream as illustrative of the priesthood in the manner referred to above have not considered it. We doubt if there could be found a man, even in Utah, who would claim that the *fountain* of the priesthood was in the man who ordains, or in the office he holds. If there should be such an one, he has obtained his information by

the use of "keys that the written word never spoke of, nor never will."

Those who will examine the subject carefully will, we are sure, be able to discern that no man is this dispensation has been ordained by authority more defensible than was Joseph Smith, the son of the Prophet. By virtue of birthright; by virtue of calling, blessing, and appointment; by virtue of being chosen by the Church of God; by virtue of a regular and authoritative ordination, he is President of the High Priesthood and of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Third: *Has his subsequent teaching given evidence that he is the true successor of Joseph Smith, his father?*

An appeal to the revelations of God will settle this point. The Lord as early as February, 1831, informed the church what the work of the successor of Joseph Smith would be. He says:—

> But verily, verily I say unto you, that none else shall be appointed unto this gift except it be through him, for if it be taken from him he shall not have power, except to appoint another in his stead; and this shall be a law unto you, that ye receive not the teachings of any that shall come before you as revelations, or commandments; and this I give unto you, that you may not be deceived, that you may know they are not of me. For verily I say unto you, that he that is ordained of me, shall come in at the gate and be ordained as I have told you before, to teach those revelations which you have received, and shall receive through him whom I have appointed.—Doc. and Cov. 43: 2.

This suggests that there would be danger of being deceived by purported revelations that would be presented after the removal of Joseph Smith, and the Lord gives a key whereby they could be detected and by which the church could know they were not of him. The test was this: that the one chosen of God to succeed Joseph was to come in at the gate, be ordained according to God's instruction, and he was "to teach those *revelations which*

you have received, and shall receive," etc. Then the revelations that were to be *received after this one* must agree with those that *had been received before,* or the successor of Joseph Smith could not teach *both.* The church was warned to "receive not the teachings of any that shall come before you as revelations, or commandments; and this I give unto you, that you may not be deceived, that you may *know they are not of me.*" If any reliance can be placed in this language, then can we *know* that the revelation introduced in August, 1852, was not of God, and that the teachings of those who then came before the church with revelations and commandments were not to be received. The son of the Prophet should not be blamed for rejecting the doctrine of plurality of wives, for one of the conditions of his appointment was that he was to teach the *former* and the *latter* revelations. He could not accept polygamy and still teach: "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else," etc. (D. C. 42: 7); "There shall not any man among you have save it be one wife: and concubines he shall have none," etc. (Book of Mormon, Jacob 2: 6.)

Others may feel at liberty to believe and advocate that God has abrogated this law and commanded a departure from it, but the successor of Joseph Smith cannot. Upon him the obligation is laid "to teach those revelations which you *have received* [before the one contained in Doctrine and Covenants section 43] and *shall receive.*"

The son of the Prophet took the only course open to him, as his father's successor, in rejecting that which was opposed to the former commandments. Not only is this true regarding polygamy, but on all points of doctrine and church government he has appealed for authority to the revelations of God, in harmony with the commandment which says: "And these shall be their teachings, as they shall be directed by the Spirit." (D. C. 42: 5.)

Then his teaching has given evidence that he is the true successor of Joseph Smith, his father.

Our task is done. This treatise is not an exhaustive one, for much more might be said upon the several points treated upon. We have been especially moderate in quoting the abominable teachings of the Utah authorities, having chosen but few of the many passages so shocking to the moral sense of honest people, and relating none of the many reports (some of which are well authenticated) of their practicing as they taught. Upon this as upon other points we have only used what we considered sufficient material to meet the issue. The investigation has convinced us more thoroughly than before that the Utah Church is a rejected church, and that the Reorganization stands upon an impregnable rock of defense.

Humbly we send forth our conclusions, and our reasons therefor, praying that they may prove encouraging and confirming to the faithful, and warning and convincing to the erring.

Though we expect to give an account for our teaching as well as our conduct at the bar of God, we do not hesitate to present to the reader the *Reorganized* Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints as the Church of Jesus Christ, and Joseph Smith the son of the Martyr as its Prophet and President.

CHAPTER 13.

CORRESPONDENCE—LETTERS OF LONG—OF DESERET NEWS—OF C. W. PENROSE—OF CLARK—OF RICHARDS—POSITION OF RICHARDS AND PENROSE — OF REORGANIZATION — PRESIDENCY—APOSTLESHIP—PRESIDENCY OF HIGH PRIESTHOOD—JOSEPHITE CONTENTION SUSTAINED—PENROSE DILEMMA—CONCLUSION.

SINCE concluding the foregoing chapters the following correspondence has come into our possession, and as questions are answered therein which we had vainly attempted to have answered before, we will present it. We give the correspondence in full that these men and their methods may be presented to the reader in their own words.

It appears that Mr. Long was under the impression that Mr. Penrose was Editor of the *Deseret News*, and so addressed him. The *News* answered the first two communications without the knowledge of Mr. Penrose. The last letter Mr. Penrose received and answered in person. This will account for the misunderstanding. Mr. Richards is the official Historian of the Utah Church, and Mr. Penrose is connected with the same department, hence their statements on historical points will doubtless be considered official.

The letters read as follows:—

HIGDON, Ala., Nov. 19, 1897.

To the Editor *Deseret Evening News*, Salt Lake City, Utah;

Dear Sir:—I write you as an investigator, seeking to know the truth. I am a member of the Baptist Church, but I am interested in what is called by your people and others, the latter-day work.

I have kept and cared for elders of the church under the presidency of Wilford Woodruff, commonly called "Brighamites." I have also kept and cared for elders (or an elder) of the church under the presidency of Joseph Smith, of Lamoni,

Iowa, commonly called "Josephites" or the "Reorganized Church."

These elders do not agree as to the calling and ordination of Brigham Young as President of the Church after the death of Joseph Smith in 1844. The Josephite elders claim that he never was properly ordained; only elected as President of the Church.

Will you please tell me if this is true or not? If he was ordained, please state by what authority and who officiated, that I may be able to answer the "Josephites" if it be a false claim.

By answering the above and giving me any other information you may feel led to give, you will greatly oblige,

Yours respectfully,
J. O. LONG.

Office of *Deseret News* Publishing Company.
SALT LAKE CITY, Utah, Dec. 6, 1897.

J. O. LONG, ESQ., Higdon, Ala.;

Dear Sir:—The Mormon Elders have frequently to meet the misrepresentations made by the Josephite Elders, and in order to meet this matter fully without entering into private discussions, Elder B. H. Roberts has written a book called the "Succession in the Presidency," in which he sets forth all the particulars in relation to the succession of President Brigham Young to President Joseph Smith, and we think he has covered the ground very successfully and has left nothing whatever for our opponents, the Josephites, to base their claims on. We forward you to-day a copy of the book, the price of which is 30 cents, and we trust you will kindly remit the amount to us by return mail.

Yours truly,
DESERET NEWS PUBLISHING CO.
Evans, Manager.

HIGDON, Ala., Jan. 26, 1898.

MR. C. W. PENROSE, Editor *Deseret News*,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dear Sir:—In reply to yours of December 6, 1897:—

After examining the book "Succession in the Presidency," with some care, I yet find no answer to the question in my former letter of inquiry to you; viz.: "Was Brigham Young properly ordained as President of the Church after Joseph Smith's death, and if so, when and by whom?" which you will please answer if you have the data at hand.

As before-stated I am not a "Brighamite" or "Josephite," but a Baptist; but I am interested in this question, hence my importunity.

Enclosed is 30cts. to pay for book and also self-addressed, stamped envelope for your reply to me.

Trusting my importunity will not weary your patience, and hoping to have an early reply, I am,

Yours respectfully,

J. O. LONG.

"The only answer to this letter was a postal card acknowledging the receipt of the 30 cts."

Office of *Deseret News* Publishing Company.

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah, Feb. 7, 1898.

J. O. LONG, Higdon, Ala.

We have received your favor of Jan. 26, 1898, containing $\frac{30}{100}$ dollars, and the amount of the remittance has been placed to your credit on account.

Thanking you for past favors, and soliciting your kind patronage, in the future, we remain,

Yours truly,

DESERET NEWS PUBLISHING CO.,

Per Neslen.

HIGDON, Ala., May 12, 1898.

MR. C. W. PENROSE, Ed. *Deseret News*, Salt Lake City.

Dear Sir:—On November 19, 1897, I wrote you asking for information as to who ordained Brigham Young as President of the Latter Day Saint or Mormon Church.

My reasons for writing you, as then stated were: I had been a friend to both the elders of your church and those of the Reorganized Church; had lodged and fed them both: had heard them talk; and as an honest man, wanted to know if the claim made by the "Josephites;" viz.: that Brigham Young was never ordained at all, as President of the Church, was true: and asked you the question, "If he was ordained, where and by whom was it done?" Your answer to my letter was a charge of misrepresentation by you against the "Josephites" and you also sent a work entitled ——— by Elder B. H. Roberts, which you thought "covered all the grounds."

The book I carefully read and found no answer to my question, and wrote you again on the 26th of January, 1898, so informing you, and repeated my question in the following form: "Was Brigham Young properly ordained as President of the Church after Joseph Smith's death, and if so, when and by whom?"

To this letter you was pleased to make no reply, or at least I received none, although I sent you self-addressed stamped envelope.

I write again, hoping you will reply, and, if you do not, I shall be forced to believe the charge of misrepresentation, so

far as this point is concerned, should not be lodged against the "Josephites."

As before-stated, I am a Baptist, but I want to know the truth in all things, and as for this point, I thought *one* letter from you would settle it; but so far you have evaded the matter, and I must say that the impression you have made on me by this evasion is not for the best for your side, as it leads to the conclusion that the claim of the Josephites is true.

May I hear from you soon, please?

Respectfully, J. O. LONG.

Historian's Office, 60 E. South Temple Street,
SALT LAKE CITY, Utah, May 18, 1898.

J. O. LONG, Esq., Higdon, Ala.

Dear Sir:—I have this moment received over your signature a very imperative and peremptory letter. My first impulse was to treat it as insulting letters should be treated, but on reading it carefully I regard it as the result of some mistakes on your part, and lest it might be a fact that you are honestly seeking for information, I reply to it without ill-feeling. I am not aware that I have ever received a communication from you before. I am not the editor of the *Deseret News*. I have not sent to you a work entitled "Succession," nor have I received from you any "self-addressed," stamped envelope; nor have I, as you so bluntly charge, "evaded" any matter which you claim to have presented. And further, I am not aware that I am under any obligation to answer letters addressed to me in the spirit of the communication now before me. So much for that.

Now my dear sir, to your question: "Was Brigham Young properly ordained as President of the Church after Joseph Smith's death, and if so, when and by whom?"

In asking that question you are evidently under a misapprehension as to the order of Priesthood and Presidency in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. That arises, doubtless, from an idea that has been entertained by persons in the "Reorganized" Church as to the meaning of the revelation given March 28, 1835, Section 107; 21, 22. D. and C.

"Of necessity there are Presidents or Presiding offices growing out of, or appointed of or from among those who are ordained to the several offices in these two Priesthoods."

"Of the Melchisedek Priesthood, three Presiding High Priests chosen by the body, appointed and ordained to that office, and upheld by the confidence, faith and prayer of the Church, form a quorum of the Presidency of the Church."

Brigham Young at the death of Joseph was the President of the Twelve Apostles, so designated by revelation. Apostles are Presiding High Priests, appointed and ordained to that office. He having been so appointed and ordained was in due time

chosen by the body and upheld by the confidence, faith and prayer of the Church, and with two counselors, each of whom was also a Presiding High Priest, having been appointed and ordained to that office, thus became the First Presidency, according to the revelation.

No man is ordained President of the Church. He is ordained to that Priesthood which qualifies him for the position of President when chosen and sustained by the Church. The question might be asked, when was Joseph the Prophet ordained President of the Church? He was ordained an Apostle and thus being a Presiding High Priest was accepted by the Church and sustained in that capacity.

Priesthood is conferred by ordination; Presidency is another thing. It does not come by ordination, using that term in the same sense as in reference to conferring Priesthood, nor does it come by lineage. It is by choice and appointment and the common consent of the Church; but the person so chosen must have been ordained to the proper Priesthood to be qualified for the position. The word "ordained," however, is sometimes used in another sense, as anything that God appoints or orders or ordains, but in the revelation referred to signifies evidently just what I have stated. If I have not made this sufficiently plain, I shall be willing to respond to any courteous inquiry.

Respectfully yours, etc.,

C. W. PENROSE.

EULA P. O., Jackson Co., Ala., Feb. 26, 1898.

MR. F. D. RICHARDS,

Dear Sir:—You will excuse me for writing to you; I want to ask you a question. Your elders that are doing preaching here or have been doing preaching here seem to be nice men, and we have another kind of preachers that come here; they call them Josephites. They say Brigham Young never was ordained to be President of the Church, therefore your elders haven't got any right to preach nor baptize.

Now, if you will answer my questions you will oblige.

Was Brigham Young ordained to be President of the Church? If so, who ordained him—when was he ordained and who did it?

I am asking these questions for information. You will please write and give me the information I so much want. I belong to no church.

There don't seem to be much difference between your elders and the Josephites in the way they believe, only the President of the Church.

I hope to hear from you soon and have an answer to my question. Respectfully,

JEHU B. CLARK,

EULA P. O., Jackson County, Alabama.

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah, March 7, 1898.

JEHU B. CLARK, Eula, Alabama.

My Dear Sir:—There are no dissenting branches of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. There is an organization calling itself "The Reorganized Church," but it is in no sense a branch of this Church. It is composed of persons who follow Joseph Smith, son of the deceased Prophet, and who claim that when the latter died, having been martyred for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ, the Church thereby became disorganized; a palpable absurdity. The Church founded, under God, by Joseph Smith the Prophet has continued without interruption to the present time, with the Apostleship, doctrines, ordinances, gifts and powers as established and revealed from the Lord.

In the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, no one has ever been ordained to be President of the Church. In the beginning the Lord sent Peter, James and John, and they ordained Joseph Smith an Apostle and he was instructed how to organize and build up the Church in this dispensation. When the Prophet and Apostle Joseph Smith was taken from us, Brigham Young, being President of the Twelve Apostles, it devolved upon him to preside over the Church, as the Apostle is the highest office known in the Church of Christ. So also, when the Prophet and Apostle Brigham Young died, John Taylor, being President of the Twelve Apostles, it devolved upon him. In the same manner, when he departed, Wilford Woodruff, being President of the Twelve Apostles, the Presidency devolved upon him. Neither Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, John Taylor nor Wilford Woodruff were ordained Presidents of the Church. It is not according to the order of the Church to ordain Presidents of the Church, for there is no such order of the Priesthood known in the Church. When the Savior departed, the Presiding Apostle Peter took charge, as it was his right of office, and James and John were his counselors, and that is how they seemed to be pillars in the Church, the same as it is now in the true Church. Offices in the Church are conferred by ordination, but offices of position to honor and labor are conferred by calling or appointment, and not by ordination. May the clear light of truth enable you to understand the things of God, and preserve you from being deceived by any other than the true doctrine of Christ.

Success to you in your prayerful search for the way of the Lord.

Yours in the Truth,

F. D. RICHARDS.

We are heartily glad that these men have at last taken a position on this point, and we thank Messrs. Long and

Clark for having kindly furnished us this important material.

It will be seen that both Mr. Richards and Mr. Penrose take the position that Presidents are not ordained as such, but chosen from those previously holding office by virtue of which they are eligible to the position chosen, and that they then occupy without further ordination. They apply this rule to the President of the Church, and Mr. Richards affirms that, "In the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, no one has ever been ordained to be President of the Church."

The Reorganization has taken the position (see p. 133) stated in the following:—

> Resolved, that as the office of First President of the Church grows out of the authority of the Presiding High Priest in the high priesthood, no person can legally lay claim to the office of First President of the Church, without a previous ordination to the Presidency of the High Priesthood.

So the issue is squarely before us, and we are pleased to meet it.

It will not be necessary for us to enter into an exegesis of the law, which would admit of a difference of opinion. We will simply give a few universally acknowledged historical facts which will clearly show that our learned opponents are wrong. On February 15, 1836, at Kirtland, Ohio, Presidents were chosen to the High Priests, Elders, Priests, Teachers, and Deacons quorums, and each of them duly set apart by *ordination*. The record is as follows:—

> After one hour's adjournment of the Council, Elder Don Carlos Smith was nominated and seconded to be ordained to the High Priesthood, also to officiate as President, to preside over that body in Kirtland. The vote of the respective quorums was called in their order, and passed through the whole house by their unanimous voice.
>
> Elder Alva Beeman was chosen in the same manner, to preside over the Elders in Kirtland.
>
> William Cowdery was nominated and seconded to officiate as

President over the Priests of the Aaronic Priesthood in Kirtland.

The vote of the Assembly was called, beginning at the Bishop's Council, and passing through the several authorities, until it came to the Presidency of the High Council in Kirtland, and received their sanction, having been carried unanimously, in all the departments below.

Oliver Olney was unanimously elected to preside over the Teachers in Kirtland.

Ira Bond was unanimously chosen to preside over the Deacons in Kirtland.

Elders Don Carlos Smith and Alva Beeman were ordained to the offices to which they had been elected, under the hands of Presidents Joseph Smith, Junior, S. Rigdon, and H. Smith, with many blessings.

Bishop Whitney, of Kirtland, then proceeded to ordain William Cowdery, Oliver Olney, and Ira Bond, and pronounced many blessings upon them according to their offices and standing.—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 15, pp. 593-594.

At Nauvoo, Illinois, in 1841, George Miller was chosen to succeed Don C. Smith as President of the High Priests Quorum, and of this he says:—

And at the fall conference after the death of Don Carlos Smith, I was called and *set apart* as President of the Quorum of High Priests, with my counselors Noah Packard and Amasa Lyman.—Church History, Vol. 2, p. 793.

In *Millennial Star*, Vol. 16, p. 342, we find the following: "Stephen Chase was ordained President of the Elders Quorum in Far West." This was on October 6, 1838.

Again, on March 1, 1835, "Joseph Young and Sylvester Smith were ordained Presidents of the Seventies." (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 15, p. 230.)

These are but few of the many instances that we could cite to show that in the days of Joseph the Martyr Presidents were set apart by ordination, hence Mr. Penrose is wrong when in speaking of Presidency he says: "It does not come by ordination," etc.

Not only were Presidents ordained in the church in the days of the Martyr, but the Utah Church has adopted the practice. Andrew Jensen in his "Historical Record," Vol.

5, pp. 82, 83, speaks of the ordination of Presidents of Seventies as follows: Jedediah M. Grant, in 1844; Horace S. Eldredge, October, 1854; Jacob Gates, October, 1862; William W. Taylor, 1879; Abraham H. Cannon, October 9, 1882; Seymour B. Young, October 16, 1882; Daniel Fjelsted, April 28, 1884; and John Morgan, October 7, 1884.

Pages could be filled with instances of ordinations to Presidency, but surely these are sufficient.

By the above we learn that when the quorums were first set in order under Joseph Smith the Seer, that Presidents were set apart by ordination in the quorums of Seventy, High Priests, Elders, Priests, Teachers and Deacons. Even if ordinations to Presidency were unnecessary in the apostolic quorums of First Presidency and Twelve Apostles, our opponents are too extravagant in laying down the rule that Presidency "does not come by ordination." They should have admitted the rule and claimed an exception.

Having disposed of their interpretation of the rule, it might be more in keeping with order to rest here and await the filing of their claim of exception; but as this is our closing argument, we will meet their position by showing that it is neither the rule nor the exception.

Mr. Richards makes the direct claim (to which Mr. Penrose by inference agrees) that, "In the beginning the Lord sent Peter, James, and John and they ordained Joseph Smith an Apostle, and he was instructed how to organize and build up the church in this dispensation."

They then argue that by virtue of the apostleship then conferred, (not later than September, 1830, D. C. 26: 3,) he was President of the Church. Both of these gentlemen either ignorantly or dishonestly ignore the fact that notwithstanding Joseph Smith had been an apostle since 1830, he did, on January 25, 1832, receive an additional ordination, at Amherst, Ohio, to the office of President of the

High Priesthood, (see this book, p. 143,) and that on April 26, 1832, he was received by the church in Missouri in that capacity.

It is only necessary here to cite the language of the law to show that this was tantamount to an ordination as President of the Church:—

> And again, the duty of the president of the office of the high priesthood is to preside over the whole church, and to be like unto Moses. Behold, here is wisdom, yea, to be a seer, a revelator, a translator, and a prophet; having all the gifts of God which he bestows upon the head of the church.—Doc. and Cov. 104: 42.

The assertion, then, of Mr. Richards, that "Neither Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, John Taylor, nor Wilford Woodruff, were ordained Presidents of the Church," in so far as it refers to Joseph Smith, is false. The position of the Reorganization as set forth in the above resolution is in harmony with both law and precedent. The ordination of Joseph, the son of the Martyr, to the office of President of the High Priesthood, was exactly in harmony with the ordination of his illustrious father whom he succeeds. Strange that the Utah authorities question the validity of this ordination, and yet defend the claims of Brigham Young and his successors in office, while they concede that they nor either of them had an ordination of any kind to the office of President of the Church; and Mr. Richards goes so far as to say, "It is not according to the order of the church to ordain Presidents of the church, for there is no such order of the Priesthood known in the church." This is unquestionably true as regards that church represented by Mr. Richards. But this office *is* provided for in the law given to the church organized by Joseph Smith and others in 1830. The Prophet and his colleagues were in practice in harmony with that law; and the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints as the lawful

continuation of the church organized in 1830 accepts that law and practically carries it into effect.

If, as Mr. Richards states, Brigham Young was not ordained President of the Church, then the contention of the "Josephites," as set forth in Mr. Long's letter, is sustained, and the charge of misrepresentation made by the *Deseret News* should be retracted. These men are in desperate straits and their struggles excite in us a mingled feeling of pity and contempt. The floundering of Mr. Penrose is especially pitiable. After quoting the law and seeking to construe it to mean what it does not say, he plunges into a self-contradictory tangle from which he can never disengage himself. He says: "Apostles are *Presiding* High Priests, appointed and ordained to that office." Again, he says of Joseph Smith: "*He was ordained an Apostle and thus being a Presiding High Priest was accepted* by the church and sustained in that capacity." After thus affirming that Joseph Smith was a *Presiding* High Priest by virtue of an *ordination*, he immediately flops and says Presidency "does not come by ordination." The truth is that these men realize that neither Messrs. Young, Taylor, Woodruff, nor Snow ever had an ordination to the office of President of the High Priesthood; which office, according to law, entitles a man to the right to preside over the whole church (and virtually such ordination makes him the President); and hence they conclude that Presidency "does not come by ordination;" and yet they must find some plausible excuse for Young et al. assuming to preside, and so they say they were *ordained Presiding* High Priests. The only consistent way out of this dilemma is to resolve that, Whereas, Joseph Smith, though an apostle, was ordained to the office of President of the High Priesthood; therefore, Brigham Young et al., though apostles, had no right to assume to preside over the whole church without such ordination.

When these gentlemen can establish their position that an apostle can preside over the church by virtue of his *ordination* as a *Presiding* High Priest, and at the same time sustain their contention that Presidency "does not come by ordination," we would be pleased to hear from them again.

We sincerely thank Mr. Richards for his frank acknowledgement that the Reorganization "is in no sense a branch of this [their] Church;" and congratulate Messrs. Long and Clark on their success in drawing out of these men a statement of their position where others have failed.

Again, we conclude by presenting to the reader, with renewed confidence, the Reorganized Church as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Its President is of the lineage pointed out in the revelations of God as entitled to that position. He was appointed of God through his father according to the direction given in the revelations. He was called of God by revelation according to the law which says:—

> The president of the church, who is also the president of the council, is appointed by revelation, and acknowledged, in his administration, by the voice of the church.—D. C. 99: 6.

He was regularly ordained to the office of President of the High Priesthood, as was his father before him, by virtue of which he is entitled "to preside over the whole church, and to be like unto Moses." Not one of these requisites can be claimed by Lorenzo Snow, nor his predecessors, Elders Woodruff, Taylor, and Young.

We exhort and admonish Latter Day Israel everywhere to hear and heed the inspired message of this servant of God that was addressed to them so many years ago (see pp. 138, 139), and remember that "he that heareth him that is sent, heareth the Lord who sent him."

Appendix to True Succession in Church Presidency.

BY ELDER HEMAN C. SMITH.

SINCE the publication of my book entitled True Succession in Church Presidency, which was a reply to the work of Elder B. H. Roberts of the Utah Church, entitled Succession in the Presidency of the Church, Mr. Roberts has published a second edition of his work in which he has added some new matter, in some points changed the reading of his original publication, and in some minor points undertaken to reply to me. The more important part of my argument and evidence, however, remains unchallenged by Mr. Roberts. Taken as a whole I could have afforded to have let the two books stand before the public without further comment were it not for the new matter introduced which may mislead some who are not acquainted with the history or the circumstances referred to. However, since it becomes necessary to notice the new matter, I will take occasion to briefly refer to some of his so-called replies. Elder Roberts sometimes quotes a part of a passage and leaves out the vital point of the argument. Where he quotes from private journals and writings, leaving us to infer that he has access to them while

he knows we have not, we neither admit nor deny the correctness of the quotations. This kind of evidence to a certain extent may be admissible but can not be accepted as conclusive where there is a vital point at issue. One of the most unfair things he does, however, is to insist that every one who is in sympathy with him is a competent witness, while he assumes without a particle of evidence that if a witness did not agree to the actions of the Twelve at Nauvoo he has lost his honor. If an advocate is permitted to introduce all witnesses without question who are in sympathy with his cause, and all who are not in sympathy are for that reason impeached, he can establish any proposition he may wish. This ought to be apparent even to a Brighamite, but nevertheless Mr. Roberts insists on conducting the argument on this basis.

In replying to Mr. Roberts I raised three objections to his basic proposition, viz., that Brigham Young had prophesied that "All that want to draw away a party from the Church after them, let them do it if they can, but they will not prosper." First, that the statement is not significant, as we must first determine where the Church is before we can judge of its fulfillment. Second, that the evidence of its fulfillment is not complete even from Mr. Roberts' standpoint, as there is yet a flourishing organization opposed to what he calls the Church. And third, that the evidence that Mr. Young ever made this statement is not clear.

The first two objections he entirely ignores, thus virtually conceding their strength. With these two

points conceded, we care not whether Mr. Young made the remark or not.

But he meets the third objection by simply claiming that the minutes of the meeting as published in the *Times and Seasons* were not full and adding: "But when the history of the event was more fully written his remarks were given more in detail." Mr. Roberts does not tell us how these detailed remarks were preserved for nearly twenty years without publication. Was there a verbatim report taken at the time? If so, by whom? Where is the original copy now? Or were there simply notes taken, and the skeleton perfected afterwards? Or was it written from some one's memory who was present? If he wants us to believe he should tell us something to believe. But if Mr. Roberts makes it clear that Elder Young did say just what is reported he has effected nothing so far as this controversy is concerned.

We believe that he who undertakes to lead a party from the Church will not prosper: but the question is, Where is the Church? Who represents it? Why not meet the issue without so much equivocating?

On pages 7 and 8 Mr. Roberts corrects a mistake made in his first edition and says: "Inadvertently Hyrum Smith was represented as the counselor to the Prophet," and sets forth that Sidney Rigdon and William Law were the counselors at the time of the Prophet's death.

Perhaps it was inadvertently that he failed to correct page 9 so as to harmonize with the foregoing, for there he still represents Sidney Rigdon as the fellow counselor of Hyrum Smith. This he could not

correct, however, without abandoning his former position that Rigdon was retained in the Presidency on account of the importunities of Hyrum Smith of the same quorum.

On page 13 of my treatise I called attention to President Woodruff's testimony as presented by Roberts being in conflict with the record regarding the vote on accepting Elder Rigdon. Mr. Roberts makes no effort to defend or explain the testimony of his witness, thus leaving Mr. Woodruff to be impeached without protest. Would he do this if defense had been possible?

Mr. Roberts still insists that the Twelve were sustained at that meeting in Nauvoo on August 8, 1844, as the First Presidency, and gives the resolution as quoted from *Millenial Star*, volume 25, but does not attempt to explain the discrepancy between the resolution as published at the time in the *Times and Seasons* and the one he quotes; it surely can not be explained on the ground that the first publication was shorter and the last more in detail for the one is not only shorter than the other, but is entirely of different import.

On page 8 Mr. Roberts reaffirms his charge against Sidney Rigdon; and though he had not given Mr. Rigdon the credit of being exonerated from any of the charges made against him in 1843, he now admits that the charge of treacherous correspondence with Ex-governor Carlin was satisfactorily explained but claims that the charge of treasonable conduct in connection with John C. Bennett was not explained,

and accuses us of making a part to bear off the burden of the whole.

The reader will observe that Mr. Roberts has not presented any evidence of treasonable conduct; and though we are not specially interested in defending Sidney Rigdon, we are not willing to believe him guilty of such base conduct simply on the affirmation of Mr. B. H. Roberts. He states that if any doubt exists of the treachery of Sidney Rigdon it can be dispelled by perusing the letter of John C. Bennett to him bearing date of January 10, 1843, and by the minutes of his trial before the Bishop of the Church published in volume five of *Times and Seasons*, pages 647–655 and 660–667. He gives us no reference as to where we may find the letter of John C. Bennett referred to.

A careful perusal of the minutes of the so-called trial of Sidney Rigdon does not sustain the charge of treachery. The minutes of that trial disclose a disposition on the part of Brigham Young and his associates to dominate and bring all departments of Church work under their dictation.

It is presumed to be a trial before the Presiding Bishop of the Church assisted by a council of high priests; but it is quite evident that the Twelve were in control. The minutes represent that Brigham Young was in charge. He requested the choir to sing; Orson Hyde, one of the Twelve, opened with prayer; Brigham Young made the opening remarks, though taking occasion to remark that the Twelve were simply there as witnesses, and not as judges. He was followed by remarks from Orson Hyde,

Parley P. Pratt, Amasa Lyman, John Taylor, W. W. Phelps, and Heber C. Kimball. These each of them not only gave evidence, but argued the case, and each of them presumed to decide the case before the verdict of the court was rendered. Brigham Young made the statement in his opening remarks that Joseph and Hyrum Smith, the Book of Mormon and Book of Doctrine and Covenants, the Temple, Joseph Smith's measures, and the Twelve, were all one party, and represented Elder Rigdon and others as being of opposite parties.

Orson Hyde said, "Elder Rigdon is now going to work to make a division." Mr. Hyde related a great deal of hearsay evidence, making the statement that he would omit names unless called upon; but there is no record that the names were ever called for. Elder Hyde's statement of what somebody told him without the council knowing who it was passed for evidence before that council.

Parley P. Pratt said:

I say and bear testimony that the things revealed to Sidney Rigdon touching the great battles to be fought somewhere; the secret meetings; the ordination of officers, and the government of this Church, is a revelation of falsehood and delusion, calculated to lead the people astray.

Amasa Lyman said:

There are many who seem to be in difficulty concerning Sidney Rigdon's standing in the Church during the time he has been wallowing in his filth and corruption for four or five years past.

John Taylor said:

There has already been much said, sufficient to criminate Elder Rigdon, and to prove satisfactorily to the mind of every

unprejudiced person, that he is unworthy of the confidence we have reposed in him; that he has dishonored his high and holy calling, and has in every way disqualified himself to act in that relationship to the Church, which he has heretofore sustained.

W. W. Phelps said:

He has come and lied in the name of the Lord. . . . The Devil has blinded his eyes, and he has endeavored to blind the minds of the people against those revelations that have been our guide since we came into this Church. . . . I therefore, in the authority of the holy priesthood, and as one who can not look upon sin with any degree of allowance, declare his late revelations, and his extraordinary ordinations of prophets, priests and kings among the Gentiles, holding the keys of David,—*of the Devil;* and let all the people say: Amen.

Heber C. Kimball said:

I wish the people would hear and be wise, and those who have been upholding Bro. Sidney, would turn about before they go into everlasting despair.

Thus all of these so-called witnesses presume to decide the case and tell that high council what Sidney Rigdon was guilty of, instead of simply giving testimony and allowing the council to decide the question of guilt or innocence. No respectable court understanding its prerogatives and duties, would allow witnesses to be guilty of such contempt. If Mr. Young or any of his colleagues had gone before any court of justice and used such language, they would have been reprimanded, and if not heeding the reprimand, would have been punished for contempt.

After all this Mr. Young takes the floor the second time and states what Mr. Hyde had before stated, that he had some testimony from other parties whose names he would not give if it could be dispensed with, and so far as the record is concerned it seems

to have been dispensed with. There is no record of the names being called for, nor of the parties being brought before the council.

The law gave Mr. Rigdon the privilege of having a part of the council to speak in his behalf. One of the council did volunteer to do so, namely, William Marks. Then instead of other members of the council speaking against the accused as provided in the law, Brigham Young, one of the witnesses in the case, is permitted to reply to Mr. Marks. And in that reply he says: "I have known that Bro. Marks had no evidence but the written word; but if this people have no evidence but the written word, it is quite time to go to the river and be baptized for the remission of their sins."

Witness Young was followed by witness Phelps in answer to William Marks. He was followed by witness Hyde. After these three chief witnesses had been allowed to speak in answer to the arguments of one of the council, Bishop Whitney, who presided, gave privilege for any other councilor to speak who wished to do so, but no one responded.

Taking into consideration that Newel K. Whitney, who presided over that council, was not at the time Presiding Bishop of the Church, but was substituted for George Miller, who was appointed by revelation as Presiding Bishop of the Church; and the further fact that he was himself implicated as a party in the case, as is evidenced from the statement of Brigham Young before the court that he accompanied eight of the Twelve when they went to converse with Sidney Rigdon, laboring with him—and upon the matters

developed in that labor these charges were based, and we have a case equaled by none on record, to our knowledge, for injustice and partiality.

There are many other points of criticism that we might make on this trial, but we forbear. No one who reads the records of those times impartially will allow that trial to have any effect in passing judgment upon Sidney Rigdon.

It will be remembered that I cited Mr. Roberts to his inaccuracy in stating that William Smith was expelled from the Church at the time when he was simply suspended from exercising the functions of his office; to which Mr. Roberts now replies: "Suspended from exercising the functions of their office comes so preciously near suspension of fellowship for an apostle as an apostle, that the Josephite 'Reply' is welcome to all that exists in the difference." —Page 19.

I thank Mr. Roberts for his liberality in this case, and accept the difference cheerfully.

In Mr. Roberts' first edition he claims that William Smith did not teach the doctrine of lineal priesthood until 1850. I showed from the writings of one in sympathy with Mr. Roberts' faith, that he was teaching it in St. Louis in November, 1845.

Mr. Roberts, on page 26 of his revised edition, acknowledges his error, and claims that his fault was in trusting too implicitly in Josephite statements of its own history. He says:

> The authority upon which the statement of the text was made is from the statement of Jason W. Briggs, once a leading light of the "Reorganized Church," and by Tullidge in his account of

the rise of said Church, called the "first standard-bearer of Israel's return." The statement by Briggs is quoted with approval by Tullidge, and Tullidge's History here quoted is "Published by the Board of Publication of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." (See title page Life of Joseph the Prophet by Tullidge, Plano edition, 1880.) Following is the passage in question:

"In the general disorder that prevailed from the death of Joseph Smith, here and there appeared a gleam of light and hope—a manifestation of the Spirit that all was not lost. Many ran to and fro in the character of prophets and shepherds. Among those appeared William Smith, who in the spring of 1850, called a conference at Covington, Kentucky; from which time he visited many of the branches and scattered Saints, teaching lineal priesthood, as applying to the Presidency of the Church; and thus disposing of all pretenders already arisen, or to rise out of the posterity of the original President of the Church. This principle, though pretty clearly shown in the books, had been almost entirely overlooked or forgotten by the Saints; but when their attention was then called to it many at once accepted it as the solution of the question of Presidency."—(Page 576.)

This quotation is not accurate; but the most damaging mistake made is in changing the word *thus* to *then*. The quotation as it reads in the work from which Mr. Roberts quoted is:

This principle, though pretty clearly shown in the books, had been almost entirely overlooked or forgotten by the Saints; but, when their attention was thus called to it, many at once received it as the solution of the question of Presidency. (See page 576, Tullidge's History.)

A mistake like this might occur without design; but when it is a mistake made to favor a theory that he is just at that time urging, it looks suspicious. Mr. Roberts was trying to maintain that *then*, in 1850, was the first time, according to Josephite history, that William Smith taught the doctrine of lineal priest-

hood; and by changing the word *thus* to make it read *then* it would favor his point. What makes it more suspicious than before is that he quotes from the same passage again on page 37, and there he quotes it correctly and italicizes the word *thus* when striving to make the point that it was through William Smith's teaching that lineal priesthood was first known. To make one point he changes the reading by substituting another word; to make another point he emphasizes the original word, probably forgetting his former effort. There is nothing in the quotation from Elder Briggs to intimate that William Smith had not taught lineal priesthood prior to the Covington conference.

In his first edition in speaking of Lyman Wight, he made the positive statement:

> In the latter part of August, 1844, President Young desired him to return to the pineries and continue his labors; but he refused and expressed a determination to carry out his own views, and be the controller of his own conduct regardless of the counsel of the presiding quorum. He therefore went to Texas instead of to Wisconsin, taking a small company of the Saints with him, and settling in Texas, not far from the present site of Austin.—Page 26.

I showed that Lyman Wight did in fact go to Wisconsin at the time when Mr. Roberts says he refused to go.

Now on page 28 of his second edition Mr. Roberts changes the text in the body of his work and makes it to read, "He therefore finally went to Texas instead of to Wisconsin to get out timbers for the Temple," and so forth, thus throwing in an explanatory statement that was not in the first edition, and contending

that that was his point in the beginning, that he did not go to get out timbers for the Temple. If he intended to say *that* he certainly failed in his intentions, for not an intimation of such a thing is found in his first edition.

He then contends that he was right in his main contention that Lyman Wight was not in harmony with his fellow apostles, and that he refused to follow their counsel, and goes on to some length to prove this assertion. He might have saved himself this trouble; for I made no claim to the contrary. I am aware that he was not in harmony with Brigham Young and others and refused to follow their counsel; and hence no testimony to that fact was necessary.

Again, Mr. Roberts claimed that Lyman Wight lived in obscurity and died outside the church of Christ without a following. When I showed that he had continued to have a following to the time of his death; and that many are still following in the line of his counsel and teaching on the doctrine of lineal priesthood he changes the text again, and throws in after the words, "without a following," the words, "worthy the name of following." A very convenient way for a man to escape the dilemma of his wrong conclusions is to change without explanation or confession, and decide that the *followiny* was not worthy the name.

I do not care in this treatise to enter into the discussion of the question of worthiness; and hence leave the matter for the reader to judge of the dilemma a man is in who will thus change and pass

judgment upon a body of people in order to escape the error that he has fallen into.

Mr. Roberts, on pages 48 and 49, enters into a labored argument to show that the revelation coming through Elder Deam required determination as to who held the highest authority previous to the choosing of the seven apostles.

This is not material; and I have already spent as much time as I care to spend on this point. I shall therefore be content with quoting the words themselves, and permitting the reader to form his own conclusion. Here are the words of the communication:

> Verily, thus saith the Lord, as I said unto my servant Moses, "See thou do all things according to the pattern," so say I unto you. Behold, the pattern is before you. It is my will that you respect authority in my church; therefore let the greatest among you preside at your conference. Let three men be appointed by the conference to select seven men from among you, who shall compose a majority of the Twelve Apostles; for it is my will that that quorum should not be filled up at present. Let the president of the conference, assisted by two others, ordain them. (The senior of them shall preside.) Let them select twelve men from among you, and ordain them to compose my High Council. Behold, ye understand the order of the Bishopric, the Seventy, the Elders, the Priests, Teachers and Deacons. These organize according to the pattern. Behold, I will be with you unto the end; even so, Amen. (See Church History, vol. 3, pp. 217, 218.)

It will be seen from this, that while the one holding the greatest authority before the conference was to preside at the conference, it was the senior of the seven who was to act as the President of the Church.

There is another point referred to by Mr. Roberts

on page 49 of his revised version which may need a more extended notice. In his first edition he said:

We have now followed the history of the Reorganized Church as far as it is necessary. It only remains to remark that it is a stream formed by the confluence of two other streams; one of which, represented by Mr. Gurley and his following, flows from Strangism; and the other, represented by Mr. Briggs and his following, flows from the Church organized by William Smith. We leave it for Josephites to inform us on what principle of philosophy two corrupt, apostate streams by uniting, make a pure one!

On this I commented as follows:

This conclusion is evidently based upon the supposition that when parties come out of one organization to affiliate with another, the one they leave becomes a part of the one to which they adhere.

How profound! According to this philosophy the Church organized by Joseph Smith and others from 1830 to 1835, was a stream formed by the confluence of several other streams issuing from the several sectarian Churches. (See page 34.)

In his rejoinder Mr. Roberts seeks to ingeniously avoid the consequence of this false philosophy of his by turning the controversy upon a point that was not even hinted at in his first supposition and says:

Not at all. The circumstances are wholly different. When the Lord in the first vision to the Prophet Joseph announced his rejection of all sectarian Churches there had to be a restoration of divine authority, and hence sent John the Baptist, Peter, James, and John, and others to restore that authority; and all who left the several sectarian Churches, received the gospel and divine authority through this new dispensation of authority from heaven, and hence in the new Church thus formed there was no taint of the old sects from which they had emerged—or, in other words, no flaw in their claims to divine authority.

This is quite fairly stated, but it is foreign to the point Mr. Roberts raised in his first edition. The cir-

cumstances so far as they relate to his first contention are exactly parallel.

God by revelation "announced his rejection of all sectarian Churches." He authorized the organization of another and many came out of them and united with the new Church thus formed. They brought with them no taint of the old, but built on divine authority before restored through Joseph Smith the Seer, and others.

Again God by revelation "announced his rejection" of the Churches under James J. Strang, William Smith, and others. He authorized the forming of another organization, and some came out of these rejected organizations and united with the one thus formed. They brought with them no taint of the old, but built on divine authority before restored through Joseph Smith the Seer, and others. The Church organized from 1830 to 1835 was the successor of a Church once acknowledged of God, but rejected on account of transgression, though authorized sectarian Churches had intervened between, and it was in fact a reorganization.

The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints was the successor of a Church once acknowledged of God, but rejected on account of transgression, though unauthorized sects had intervened between. In both cases members entering into the new organizations renounced all allegiance to these unauthorized sects, and repudiated all authority claimed by them. Then the cases *are* parallel, and if one was formed by the confluence of corrupt, apostate streams, so was the other.

But as Mr. Roberts has sought to turn our attention from the above to the questions of authority, Church organization and rejection, let us follow him in his flight. He adds:

> But with the Josephite reorganizers it is different. They claim that the Church founded by the Prophet Joseph was rejected of God, together with its dead. . . . If that were true, then its actions were repudiated, its authority was gone; and the only way it could be regained would be by a reopening of the heavens, and a restoration of the priesthood as in the dispensation of the gospel received by Joseph the Prophet.

Then by endeavoring to hold the Reorganization to the philosophy of his own conclusions Mr. Roberts argues that the men instrumental in its formation were inconsistent in proceeding to reorganize without a restoration of divine authority.

Mr. Roberts' error consists in supposing that authority is contingent upon Church organization, and hence when an organization is rejected all authority is gone. He is evidently wrong in this, for authority preceded Church organization and hence could exist when said organization was rejected. Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery were ordained and authorized to administer in the priesthood before there was a Church, and by the authority thus bestowed the Church organization was effected.

So priesthood may exist independent of Church organization, and hence could be retained by individuals after the organization was rejected. I would like to suggest to Mr. Roberts that if he will change his premises and instead of arguing from the premises that authority is contingent upon organization, argue from the premises that organization is contin-

gent upon authority, his logical brain will lead him to safer conclusions.

Further, though the priesthood held by Briggs, Gurley, Deam, *et al.*, was doubtless good and accepted of God, they did not proceed in the important matter of organization until so directed by revelation from God. So as far as that particular act was concerned the authority was restored.

On page 53 Mr. Roberts again concedes that he was mistaken in setting the date of Lyman Wight's advocacy of lineal priesthood at 1850; but he still contends "that this question of 'Young Joseph's' claims to the Presidency was not mooted in the controversy over the Presidency at Nauvoo in August, 1844, the time of all times for those who knew anything of the subject to have spoken."

In my reply I presented the fact that William Smith and Lyman Wight preached lineal descent so soon after their difference with others of the Twelve as to make it strong presumptive evidence that this was one of the points of difference. We invited attention to the fact that the real points of difference were never published; that the Church papers were silent upon the point; and that neither William Smith nor Lyman Wight had an opportunity to preserve their opinions in any periodical of the times. Mr. Roberts ignores all this, and still asserts that they and all others were silent upon this point.

Fortunately, since the publication of our reply, the evidence has come to our hand which removes all possible doubt; and it is not necessary for us to stand upon this presumption, plain though it may be.

We have before us a letter written by James Blakeslee to Jacob Scott, dated Hampton, Rock Island County, Illinois, August 16, 1844, just eight days after the memorable meeting on August 8 on which so much has been said, and at which time so much was said regarding Presidency and leadership. He says:

> But alas, what a change one year has made. Even the space of about one year, or a little more, has successfully introduced into the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, a sufficient amount of false doctrine, to deceive and lead away nearly all the Church at Nauvoo, while the Prophet and Patriarch of the Church have been barbarously murdered by the hand of a gang of demons in human shape. Thus you see, sir, that the Church is left without an earthly head, unless the promise of the Lord shall be fulfilled, which saith, that if he removed Joseph, he would appoint another in his stead. But as this has not yet been done, what is the Church to do? Now sir, if I have been correctly informed, some of the members of the Church at Nauvoo, want Stephen Markham for their head, and others Sidney Rigdon, and others President Marks, and others little Joseph, and others B. Young, and some others P. P. Pratt, and if they can all have their choice, we shall soon have a multiplicity of Churches of Latter Day Saints.

It appears that Elder Blakeslee was not present at Nauvoo; but that in about one week after that meeting word had reached him of the controversy over leadership at Nauvoo, and that in that controversy young Joseph's name was mentioned with others. This sets aside effectually and positively the statement of Elder Roberts that young Joseph's claims to the Presidency were not mooted in the controversy.

Mr. Roberts thinks I might have added some inter-

esting information in connection with my extract from the *Gospel Herald* regarding the position of Lyman Wight on lineal priesthood had I quoted John E. Page in that connection. Doubtless it might be interesting information, but it is not material to the point in discussion. I was only attempting to show that William Smith and Lyman Wight taught lineal priesthood. I was aware that John E. Page did not. His opinion has no more bearing upon the point as to what William Smith and Lyman Wight taught than has the opinion of Young, Kimball, or Pratt.

Mr. Roberts undertook to show a discrepancy in the testimony regarding the blessing of President Joseph Smith, a part of the testimony going to show that he was blessed in Liberty Jail, and a part to show that he was blessed soon after coming out of Liberty Jail. I showed that he was several times blessed to the same effect. All Mr. Roberts has to say in his late edition is to ask how many times it is necessary that young Joseph should be blessed, appointed, and ordained to the same position by the same person. It is not necessary for us to answer the question. It is only necessary to show that he was actually blessed at different times and places, and this I have clearly shown. The question of necessity should be asked of those who participated in this blessing.

Mr. Roberts makes a labored effort to show a conflict between Elder Whitehead and others because Elder Whitehead calls this blessing an ordination while others do not. It is not necessary to occupy space in arguing this. President Joseph Smith

explains it sufficiently clear in the quotation which Mr. Roberts himself inserts; he says, "*This blessing has by some been called an ordination*, from the usual predilection to confound names and terms."

The evidence shows that the Prophet Joseph Smith laid his hands at different times upon the head of his son and blessed him, declaring that he would succeed him in his position in the Church. That is all we claim. We have not taken a position as to whether priesthood was conferred or not; simply that in fulfillment of the revelation he designated who the successor should be. In the sense of an appointment it may be called an ordination.

Mr. Roberts thinks it very strange that young Joseph was set apart before the congregation where there were thousands present, and that that congregation accepted him, and yet Mr. Whitehead is the "sole witness." He thinks it very reasonable that others in that congregation would have remembered it, and would have contended at the time that he was the rightful successor. The strangeness of it is admitted; and one wonders why if true that the efforts of Brigham Young were successful with so many. But we have the positive testimony that Mr. Whitehead was not the "sole witness," and that young Joseph's claims were advocated by some, I know not how many, in August, 1844, as evidenced from the letter of Elder Blakeslee before quoted.

John H. Carter, of near Provo City, Utah, in his testimony in the Temple Lot Suit said:

I was present at a meeting in the city of Nauvoo, in the state of Illinois, at which something was said or done about the successor

of Joseph Smith. It was held in the Bowery, right north of the Temple, and Joseph Smith was on the stand. I can not tell you when it was, but it was not long before he was killed. This happened in Nauvoo, in the Bowery that was erected right north of the Temple, where they held meetings before the Temple was finished. Yes sir, Joseph Smith who was called Junior, was on the stand. It was on a Sunday. There was a congregation gathered there on that occasion; it was a large gathering. It was the people mostly from Nauvoo who had gathered there, and when they got together on these occasions there was a large gathering. . . .

Joseph Smith came on the stand leading his son, young Joseph, and they sat him down on a bench at the Prophet's right hand, and Joseph got up and began to preach and talk to the people, and the question he said was asked by somebody, "If Joseph Smith should be killed or die, who would be his successor?" And he turned around and said, pointing to his son, "There is the successor," and he went on and said, "My work is pretty nearly done," and that is about all he said in regard to his son. He said in answer to a question that was asked as to who should be his successor in case he should be killed or die, and he pointed to his son, young Joseph, who was sitting there at his side, and said he: "There is your leader."

My father-in-law was with me at the time, and sat there and heard what was said, and when we were going home my father-in-law asked, "What does that mean?" He said, "That has got a meaning to it, from the way Joseph talked and pointed to his son," because Joseph had said, "There is your leader," pointing at the time to his son, and my father-in-law said, "We will see the fulfillment of that by and by."

It was the understanding of the people generally, of the Church as far as I know; all understood it from that day on that when the boy Joseph came of age he would take the lead in the Church and be its head. There were a great many people who believed that, and moreover, President Young preached it himself for some time after he came into the valley. That was the belief of hundreds and thousands; was the belief then, and is the belief now.

I have always believed that ever since I heard Joseph say the words I have stated, ever since I saw his father point him out; and I believe it to-day just as strongly as I ever did, and it was under that belief that I have followed President Young west with the branch of the Church now known as the Salt Lake branch. That was the teaching and the ideas held out by the officers and elders, including Brigham Young and other prominent elders of the Church, who afterwards came west and located here at Salt Lake City; and it was the teaching in Utah Territory for several years after the death of Joseph Smith. Here in Salt Lake City they publicly taught and held out the idea to the members of the Church that Joseph Smith the son of Joseph Smith, Jr., would eventually be the President of the Church.—Plaintiff's Abstract, pp. 180, 181.

This testimony corroborates in the main features the statements made by Elder Whitehead; and also accounts for, what otherwise would seem strange, how Brigham Young succeeded so well. Thousands, according to Mr. Carter, accepted his teachings because he held out the idea that young Joseph would be the proper person to take the leadership of the Church when he became of age.

This testimony of Elders Whitehead and Carter is strengthened by the testimony of Charles Derry, W. W. Phelps, Alpheus Cutler, P. P. Pratt, D. S. Mills, Lucy Smith, George Miller, Louis Gaulter, Harriet E. Gaulter, Arthur Milliken, and A. B. Moore, as set forth in our former reply.

Mr. Roberts in his former reply presented the claim of Brigham Young that Hyrum Smith was appointed by Joseph as his successor. I met this by saying that if this claim be true it would destroy the prophetic character of Joseph Smith, as it failed of fulfillment. Mr. Roberts can not see how it

would affect the prophetic character of Joseph Smith. I do not know how to make it plainer. If Joseph Smith said Hyrum would be his successor and Hyrum fell in death before he did, it shows beyond controversy that Joseph Smith was deceived in setting apart as his successor a man whom God never intended to succeed him. If this does not affect the evidence of his prophetic calling I do not know what would.

Again, if Joseph Smith set Hyrum apart as his successor, where is the consistency in the claim that he provided that the Twelve should succeed him by conferring upon them all the keys and responsibilities which he had himself held?

Elder Orson Hyde in his testimony before the Bishop's court that tried Sidney Rigdon, makes a pertinent statement on this point. It is as follows:

> Now why did he say to the Twelve on YOUR shoulders will this responsibility rest, why did he not mention Bro. Hyrum? The Spirit knew that Hyrum would be taken with him, and hence he did not mention his name; Elder Rigdon's name was not mentioned, although he was here all the time, but he did not attend our councils.—*Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, p. 651.

Here is a direct conflict between Elders Young and Hyde, Elder Young stating that Joseph did ordain Hyrum as his successor, and Elder Hyde stating that Joseph did not mention him because the Spirit knew that Hyrum would be taken with him. Can Mr. Roberts or any other advocate of that theory reconcile these statements?

On page 79 Mr. Roberts states that I had no other means of escape from certain conclusions only to

throw discredit upon passages in the history of the Prophet, because I questioned the genuineness of some publications issued by the Utah Church.

It was not the writer of the "Reply" that threw discredit upon the history of the Church as published by the Utah people; but that discredit has been the result of their own acts. In the face of the facts it will avail nothing for Mr. Roberts to call references to this subject "contemptible Josephite quibbling."

The late Elder Charles W. Wandell, who in 1845 was employed in the historian's office in Nauvoo, in speaking of the purported writings of Joseph Smith the Seer, notices some interpolations and then remarks:

> I notice these interpolations because having been employed (myself) in the historian's office at Nauvoo by Doctor Richards, and employed too, in 1845, in compiling this very autobiography, I know that after Joseph's death his memoir was "doctored" to suit the new order of things, and this too by the direct order of Brigham Young to Doctor Richards, and systematically by Richards.—From manuscript in my possession.

I presume Mr. Roberts will resort to his usual tactics, and say that Elder Wandell had lost his honor when he offered this statement; but he will hardly claim that George A. Smith and Wilford Woodruff had lost their honor when they stated the following as found on page 5 of the preface to the first volume of Church History as published by the Utah Church, in 1902:

> The history of Joseph Smith is now before the world, and we are satisfied that a history more correct in its details than this was never published. To have it strictly correct, the greatest possible pains have been taken by the historians and clerks

engaged in the work. They were eye and ear witnesses of nearly all the transactions recorded in this history, most of which were reported as they transpired, and, where they were not personally present, they have had access to those who were. Moreover, since the death of the Prophet Joseph, the history has been carefully revised under the strict inspection of President Brigham Young, and approved by him. We, therefore, hereby bear our testimony to all the world, unto whom these words shall come, that the history of Joseph Smith is true, and is one of the most authentic histories ever written.

This certainly agrees with the statement of Elder Wandell, and is a confession published by themselves that the history of Joseph Smith was carefully revised under the inspection of Brigham Young. Who, then, was it that threw discredit upon the genuineness of history as published in Utah? When we state that its genuineness is questionable we state just what their confession shows.

Mr. Roberts quotes an action of the conference of October, 1844, sustaining Brigham Young as one of the Twelve and First Presidency of the Church, and asks, "Can there be any doubt but what this was practically the same as that of the eighth of August?" We answer, Yes, there can be and is doubt. The whole history of the transaction shows that they ventured a little farther each succeeding time that the case was mentioned.

On page 74 Mr. Roberts misrepresents us by conveying the idea that we had taken a position that lineal priesthood as applied to the Presidency was an invariable rule, subject to no contingencies; whereas I stated our position clearly on page 50 of my first edition, that "the son's right to his father's position

is contingent upon these conditions, and that God alone is a competent judge of ability and worthiness, we hold that no man should be ordained to any office without a call from God." Our position was that all other things being equal, God had determined that the son should succeed to his father's place; but not alone by virtue of his lineage, but that he to occupy must be called of God, as God alone was the judge of availability and worthiness.

I repeat that we do not know why Hyrum Smith, an elder son than Joseph the Seer, was not chosen. He probably had the right of lineage; but God called Joseph, that is sufficient. Why should Elder Roberts contend upon this point when it is not the point at issue between us? The issue is not regarding the first or second son but regarding lineage as applying to the Presidency at all.

On page 75 Elder Roberts repeats his challenge to produce a purported revelation through Joseph Smith, President of the Reorganization, that he was called to the position. I do not know how to convey an idea to the mind of Mr. Roberts if I have not done so upon this point. We cited him to the revelation given through Jason W. Briggs, to the effect that the seed of Joseph Smith was to come forth and preside over the high priesthood of the Church; and in connection we have a revelation given to Joseph Smith indorsing that organization at Zarahemla. If the revelation indorsed that organization it indorsed the position on which it stood, that the seed of Joseph Smith the Seer was to preside over the high priesthood of the Church.

Again, when he went to Amboy, in 1860, to assume that position, he said, "I have come in obedience to a power not my own, and shall be dictated by the power that sent me." To occupy space upon this point would be useless. Though Mr. Roberts may not understand this language, I am sure that the majority of our readers can.

On pages 77 and 78 Mr. Roberts quotes a purported statement of Joseph Smith as published in *Millennial Star*, volume 22, as follows: "We have a Judas in our midst; whatever can be the matter with these men?" and throws into the midst of this quotation his own words as follows: "This appears to have had an unpleasant effect upon the minds of some leading men in the Church, especially upon the minds of William Law and William Marks, who complain before the mayor's court about the action of these special police."

By what authority does Mr. Roberts say that these were William Law and William Marks? True, their names are mentioned further on in this purported quotation; but not in the connection in which Mr. Roberts places them. It must be remembered, too, that at the time the history of Joseph Smith was carefully revised under the inspection of Brigham Young he had a controversy with William Marks that might have induced him to write his name into the revised history.

In the following pages Mr. Roberts again takes up the argument of the lesser ordaining the greater, and represents us as taking the position that the lesser ordains the greater by virtue of its position in the

priesthood. This is not and has never been the position of the Reorganization. Our position has been that a command of God is sufficient authority for an ordination; and that if one holding the lesser position is directed to ordain a man to a higher position than that which he himself holds, it is legitimate for him to do so. Our position upon this point has recently been conceded by the editors of the *Juvenile Instructor*, of which Joseph F. Smith, President of the Utah Church, is the chief editor. In commenting upon the ordination of the Twelve in 1835, the editors of this periodical say in the issue for March 1, 1902:

> This proceeding is strong evidence of the fact that the priesthood is greater than any of its offices; and further, that any man who has received the holy Melchisedec priesthood is empowered by and through the possession of that priesthood to perform any ordinance connected therewith when called upon to do so by the proper authority. For this reason we find in the history of the Church that apostles have presided over stakes of Zion, at other times they have acted as traveling elders in the foreign missions of the Church when a high priest or seventy has presided therein. It is the duty of a high priest to preside at home, but high priests are often called to labor as missionaries abroad, while seventies, whose special mission is to preach the gospel to the outside world, are occasionally called to preside at home. Again, seventies have been authorized to ordain high priests and high priests, seventies. All these apparent deviations from the usual procedure were regular and proper because every man holding the Melchisedec priesthood has within him the latent power to do all things that that priesthood authorizes, no matter what office he holds; but he has no right to depart from the limitations prescribed for his office unless he is specially called upon and appointed to do so, either by the Lord through revelation or by the Lord's representative, or by one holding an office in the priesthood whose calling

clearly authorizes him to give such instructions and special authority.

The case in point is one of the evidences of the truth of our position. Here the Lord by revelation and by the instructions of his mouthpiece calls upon three men, two of whom are high priests, to choose twelve men to form the quorum of the Twelve Apostles, and then to ordain or set them apart for this most responsible and exalted calling. He did so because they had the Melchisedec priesthood and in that priesthood was embraced the necessary authority to perform this duty. We admit that even if it did not, that the Lord himself could, if he so pleased, give these men extraordinary and unusual powers on any occasion. We have no desire to limit the powers of the Lord.

If there is any question in the minds of any as to the responsibility of the editors upon this point, the following letter will settle that question. I wrote the *Juvenile Instructor* immediately after this appeared, asking who was responsible for the answers to questions in the department of "Answers to Questions" in the *Juvenile Instructor*, and received the following:

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah, March 13, 1902.

ELDER HEMAN C. SMITH, Historian, Lamoni, Iowa.

Dear Sir: Your favor of 7th inst. is to hand. In reply I will say, the Editors of the *Juvenile Instructor* are responsible for what appears in its pages under the caption of "Answers to Questions;" indeed, by far the greater portion is written by one of themselves. Yours fraternally,

JOSEPH F. SMITH.

President Joseph F. Smith in the above takes even stronger ground than the Reorganization has ever taken in which he sets forth that one holding authority to ordain can direct another, and that other can ordain by virtue of the authority thus delegated. Which is right, President Joseph F. Smith or Elder B. H. Roberts when the latter speaks of the position

of the Reorganization on this point as "the untenable position, as false in philosophy as it is in fact, that the lesser can ordain the greater, and the greater thus accredited can ordain a still greater even the greatest of all"?

On page 85 (see also page 78) Mr. Roberts makes one of the most stupendous blunders that it has ever been our fortune to notice in a man of ordinary carefulness in controversy: He states:

The "Reply" writer seems to think there was some special virtue in the fact that William Marks took part in the ordination of young Joseph, because Marks was a high priest in the days of Joseph the Prophet. ("Reply," p. 142.) That is disposed of by the fact that Marks was a follower of the Apostate Strang and a member of his apostate church; and "Young Joseph" has said: "Whenever individuals claiming authority under the Church as organized by the first Joseph became members of any faction, they immediately became divested of all authority." (*Saints' Herald*, vol. 4, no. 10, p. 158.) And since young Joseph is a "prophet" of course that disposes of the man who is supposed to have made assurance doubly sure in ordaining him—nay, of the very man who, I believe, was mouth at his ordination.

The above quotation made by Mr. Roberts is an incomplete one. It is part of the minutes of a special conference held at Galland's Grove, Iowa, October 25 and 26, 1863, and does not purport to give the exact words of the president of the conference, but says:

The president then (in substance) made the following remarks:

"All official acts of any elder, while acting under the authority of the old Church, are recognized by us as valid; but the acts of those elders who received their authority from any of the factious organizations, such as Brigham's, Brewster's, Strang's, etc., etc., are not recognized by us as valid; for whenever any of those factions were organized, each member received his

authority from that faction; hence whenever individuals, claiming authority under the Church as organized by the first Joseph, became members of any faction, they immediately became divested of all authority except that received from the faction to which they had joined themselves. Thus when Brigham Young usurped the Presidency of the Church at or near Council Bluffs, the disorganization of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints was thereby effected, and Brigham's church was brought into existence. The same is true of all the factious organizations. Therefore from the time *they set up for themselves* their acts in a church capacity are spurious."

So we have not the exact words used upon that occasion, but the substance of them. But the most remarkable part of it all is that Mr. Roberts represents it as being the language of "Young Joseph" when there is nothing in the entire proceedings to show that young Joseph was present; but it is stated in the heading of the minutes that the district was under the presidency of Elder John A. McIntosh; and the minutes are signed right in the column opposite the one from which Mr. Roberts quotes, "John A. McIntosh, president; O. E. Holcomb, Nathan Lindsay, clerks." So the president referred to is John A. McIntosh, and not "Young Joseph" as asserted by Mr. Roberts.

If the remarks were made as reported in this synopsis, and we grant they may have been, for Uncle Johnny McIntosh, as we familiarly called him, though a man of sterling integrity, was a man of radical views, and may have held the view expressed; it commits only him, if anybody, to that position, and not President Joseph Smith. Mr. Roberts makes the blunder of referring to this several times in the

course of his reply. It is impossible for us to determine how he could make such an egregious blunder as this.

In the body of his work, page 86, Elder Roberts states that, "One who succeeds to the position of the Prophet Joseph must come in at the gate, and be ordained as the Lord had before instructed the Church—that is, he must be accepted by the Church, and be ordained by the direction of a general conference." But on page 105 he states: "Brigham Young always held, and is on record from the death of the Prophet, that the keys of the kingdom, which the Prophet Joseph held, he bestowed upon the Twelve, and that to occupy any position in the Church, they needed no other ordination."

If Mr. Roberts is right in his statement, then Elder Young is condemned as not being properly ordained to the position he held.

On page 90 he states that Amasa Lyman had been ordained a counselor to Joseph Smith the Prophet to take the place of Sidney Rigdon; "but Elder Lyman had never been presented to the people to be sustained by their vote, and hence his appointment was not completed, and he had no claim even to the counselorship in the Presidency."

If Elder Lyman had been ordained to the position of counselor, and had no claim because he had not been presented to the people to be sustained, what becomes of the claim of the Twelve even though it be conceded that Joseph appointed them to succeed him? They had not at that time been presented to the people to be sustained by their vote. If the Twelve

could be presented after the death of Joseph, why would it not have been consistent to have presented Elder Lyman at the same time instead of turning him down because he had not been previously presented to the people?

On page 86 Mr. Roberts makes the following comment on the subject of Joseph Smith appointing his successor:

> The "Reply" writer seeking to combat the limitations of the revelation here described, and contending for a larger application of it, says: "To take the position, as Mr. Roberts does, that Joseph Smith was not authorized to appoint his successor except in the event of transgression, is to make the authority to appoint contingent upon transgression." Nevertheless such are the limitations of this particular revelation, as an inspection of it will disclose; and at this point it is this particular revelation and not the general power of appointment which is under consideration. If Joseph Smith remains faithful he is to continue God's mouthpiece to the Church, and none other is to be appointed. If he transgress, then he is still to retain power enough to appoint another in his stead.

Mr. Roberts asserts, what the revelation clearly implies, that in case of transgression he is to *retain* power to appoint his successor; it follows then that he had it before the transgression. He could not *retain* that which he did not have; and hence his power to appoint is not contingent upon his transgression.

Commencing on page 93 Mr. Roberts enters into a long argument on the question of Church rejection. I shall simply content myself with quoting what the Lord has said in regard to it in paragraph 10 and part of paragraph 11, section 107, Doctrine and Covenants:

And again, verily I say unto you, Let all my saints come from afar; and send ye swift messengers, yea, chosen messengers, and say unto them, Come ye, with all your gold, and your silver, and your precious stones, and with all your antiquities; and with all who have knowledge of antiquities, that will come may come, and bring the box-tree, and the fir-tree, and the pine-tree, together with all the precious trees of the earth; and with iron, with copper, and with brass, and with zinc, and with all your precious things of the earth, and build a house to my name, for the Most High to dwell therein; for there is not a place found on earth that he may come and restore again that which was lost unto you, or, which he hath taken away, even the fullness of the priesthood; for a baptisimal font there is not upon the earth; that they, my saints, may be baptized for those who are dead; for this ordinance belongeth to my house, and can not be acceptable to me, only in the days of your poverty, wherein ye are not able to build a house unto me. But I command you, all ye my saints, to build a house unto me; and I grant unto you a sufficient time to build a house unto me, and during this time your baptisms shall be acceptable unto me.

But, behold, at the end of this appointment, your baptisms for your dead shall not be acceptable unto me; and if you do not these things at the end of the appointment, ye shall be rejected as a church with your dead, saith the Lord your God.

If this be true, that the Lord granted unto them a sufficient time to build a house, and they failed, the Church was rejected; and there is no use of Mr. Roberts pleading that they did not have time or opportunity, for the decree had gone forth that they should have a sufficient time.

I introduced witnesses in my former reply, one of them being President Brigham Young, to the effect that the temple was not completed. The testimony of these witnesses Elder Roberts has not noticed. He says we tried to bring him and Elder Charles W.

Penrose into conflict. "But there is no conflict." Whether or not there is a conflict we will leave the reader to judge. Roberts says, "The temple was completed." Mr. Penrose says: "There were probably some additions which would have been made to 'complete' the edifice in the full sense of the term if the builders had remained to enjoy it."

Referring to a point of a personal nature, as Mr. Roberts terms it in his note on page 96, I am still at a loss to understand Mr. Roberts. In his former treatise he quoted from Pratt's autobiography what purported to be a communication of the Spirit to Parley P. Pratt in 1844, and used the word *organize* where the text had it *reorganize*. I invited his attention to this, and now he says: "The copy of Pratt's autobiography in my library is the second edition, 1888, and referring to the passage again, I find was quoted accurately by me, whatever difference may exist between that and any edition the 'Reply' writer may have quoted."

I have before me the edition of 1888, and the word is plainly *reorganize* in that edition. Mr. Roberts must be mistaken; he did not use the edition of 1888 if his book reads *organize*. I trust that every one who reads this, if at all possible will get the edition of 1888 and determine who has told the truth in regard to it.

In my reply to Mr. Roberts I showed how he had confounded the terms *keys* and *oracles*, and that the words were never synonyms. This he now virtually concedes, but attempts to get out of the dilemma by saying that this is not the only passage in which

the Lord uses words in his revelations outside the technical sense in which they are used by lexicographers; and invites attention to the passage which provides that the Twelve shall ordain evangelical ministers as they shall be designated unto them by revelation. He says:

> The context clearly establishes that these "evangelical ministers" are "evangelists," or "patriarchs." Yet you shall look through your standard dictionaries in vain to find that "evangelist" and "patriarch" are equivalent terms, yet God here so uses them.

Not quite so fast, Mr. Roberts. God does not so use them. The word *patriarch* is not found in the quotation. The passage reads as follows:

> It is the duty of the Twelve, in all large branches of the Church, to ordain evangelical ministers, as they shall be designated unto them by revelation. (See Lamoni edition of Doctrine and Covenants, section 104, paragraph 17; Utah edition, section 107, paragraph 39.)

It will be observed that the word *patriarch* is not used. An evangelical minister may be a patriarch according to the definition given in our standard dictionaries. The leading definition of the word *evangelist* according to Webster is: "A bringer of the glad tidings of Christ and his doctrines." A patriarch certainly may be and ought to be that, and could be called according to this definition an evangelical minister. While all evangelists are not patriarchs, every patriarch ought to be an evangelist, or "a bringer of the glad tidings of Christ and his doctrines." So Mr. Roberts' point here is not well taken.

It will be remembered that I criticised the witnesses

of Mr. Roberts whom he quotes to prove that Joseph Smith the Seer bestowed all the authority and keys and powers which he held upon the Twelve. I showed that their language differed, no two of them giving the same words, and no one of them relating it twice alike. To which Mr. Roberts replies on page 102 as follows:

> That sort of quibbling is worthy of a tenth rate lawyer just beginning his career, or—Josephite writer. The complete answer to the contention is, that while no two of the witnesses give the same words, and no one of them, perhaps, relating the same circumstance twice employs the same language, yet the reader will see that they do not fail to make it plain that all the authority, and all the keys of power and priesthood the Prophet Joseph himself held, he conferred upon the Twelve; and that was perfectly consistent with, and even made necessary by the revelations which provide that the Twelve shall be equal in power and authority with the First Presidency.

Were these witnesses relating in their own language an event which each of them saw, Mr. Roberts' point would be well taken. It is not necessary that witnesses should use the same language in describing that which they have seen. But when they are quoting the language of another, and undertaking to say what another said, they should agree as to the words used, or we can not determine what was said, and will not be able to judge of the import.

On page 104 Mr. Roberts inserts an additional testimony upon this point of Joseph Smith ordaining the Twelve, namely, the testimony of William B. Smith as given in the Temple Lot Suit. The following answer which Elder William B. Smith acknowledges having been the author of, is the one upon which Mr.

Roberts relies, stating that this agrees with the testimony of Brigham Young, Orson Hyde, and Wilford Woodruff, to the effect that Joseph Smith the Prophet gave the keys and authority which he possessed to the Twelve.

Following is the matter referred to as it appears in an undated epistle of the Twelve and which the witness was asked to read:

PRESIDENT WILLIAM SMITH WAS ORDAINED BY HIS BROTHER JOSEPH SMITH.

Previous to President William Smith's leaving Nauvoo, on his mission to the East, for the last time during the earthly existence of his brothers, President Joseph Smith ordained him a *Prophet, Seer, Revelator,* and *Translator,* and then informed him that he had all the necessary ordinations to lead the Church (in his time), then leaped, smote his feet together, and observed that it was done; in a few days Brother William started on his mission and saw his brothers no more. He returned to Nauvoo in about a year after they were murdered.

A comparison of the above with the quotation made by Mr. Roberts will show that he has not been careful in his copying.

I can not see that there is anything in William Smith's testimony to convey the idea conveyed in the statements of Young, Hyde, and Woodruff. He simply says that Joseph Smith ordained him individually, and makes no reference in this statement to his bestowing authority upon the Twelve as such. William Smith, as we have already shown, claimed that the son of Joseph Smith was his legal successor; and in this same testimony given before the court, from which Mr. Roberts quotes a part, he says: "I held the view that in case the legal successor who I

seen as such, never came forward himself to occupy that place that I held a sufficient claim under my apostleship to be properly the legal successor to my brother Joseph, in case that position was never held at that time,—by persons who at that time were legally entitled to that position." (See answer to question 464, page 192, Original Testimony.) So he only claimed the right to preside when the legally authorized President was not installed, and only then by virtue of his apostleship.

He was further asked: "Had your brother ever undertaken to confer upon you that authority?" To which he answered: "Never any further than the ordination conferring upon me the office of an apostle." (See question 467, page 193, ibid.) The ordination referred to in the passage quoted by Mr. Roberts is thus explained by Elder Smith himself.

Though Elder William Smith was made under cross-examination to acknowledge the authorship of what Mr. Roberts quotes, the language clearly indicates that it was not the language of William Smith, as he would not call himself "Brother William." He was a very old man, hard of hearing at the time of giving his testimony in court, and in all probability was made to say what he did not intend to say, but his explanation makes it plain.

If Mr. Roberts insists upon this testimony of William Smith quoted by him without its connection being taken in evidence, it proves that William Smith was ordained the successor of Joseph Smith, not Brigham Young, nor any other member of the Quorum of Twelve, and not Hyrum Smith; and Mr.

Roberts' theory that Hyrum Smith was ordained the successor, and that the keys were all bestowed upon the Twelve as a quorum, falls to the ground under the testimony of William Smith.

On the point of succession Mr. Roberts is considerably confused. At one time he says Hyrum Smith was ordained and set apart as the successor; at another time that the keys and authority of the priesthood were bestowed upon the Twelve as a quorum and thus they were authorized to preside. And now he comes forward with the testimony that William Smith was ordained to be the successor of Joseph Smith. If Mr. Roberts and his associates will take a position upon this point so that we will know where they are and what they claim really was done to provide for succession, we will be pleased to consider their position more fully. Judging from Mr. Roberts' treatise it would be impossible to tell what their position is.

On page 109 Mr. Roberts again refers to the statement made by Brigham Young at Council Bluffs in 1847, that they were about to reorganize the Church with the First Presidency and Patriarch, and declares that the language can not be construed to mean to reorganize the Church. In his first edition he said it only referred to the Presidency. He has made a little improvement in his reply and adds the Patriarch. I said before that I was willing to let the matter stand by simply quoting the words. I am still content to do so. Here they are:

"Since the murder of President Joseph Smith, many false prophets and false teachers have arisen, and tried to deceive

many, during which time we have mostly tarried with the body of the Church, or been seeking a new location, leaving those prophets and teachers to run their race undisturbed, who have died natural deaths, or committed suicides; and we now, having in contemplation soon to reorganize the Church according to the original pattern, with a First Presidency and Patriarch, etc.

On pages 110 and 111 Mr. Roberts enters into quite an extended argument to prove that the approximates of the numerical strength of the Church as given by Joseph Smith on two different occasions, and by Wilford Woodruff, were wrong, and says, "The numbers they referred to *were simply not in the Church.*" He contends that Mr. Franklin D. Richards' estimates of about twenty-six or twenty-seven thousand are much more reliable. To confirm Elder Richards' estimates he quotes a letter from George J. Adams to the Boston, Massachusetts, *Bee*, copied in the *Times and Seasons* of March 15, 1843, where Mr. George J. Adams places the membership in the United States at fifty thousand, and those in the British Isles at twenty thousand, and says that the editor of the *Times and Seasons* corrects this by saying about ten thousand in the British Isles. Then Mr. Roberts, upon what authority I do not know, makes the statement that if Mr. Adams' estimate in the United States should be cut down one half it would be nearer the truth. After getting these reductions made it would leave thirty-five thousand, a discrepancy between Richards' figures and Roberts' lowest estimate of eight or nine thousand.

Nor does Mr. Roberts take into consideration that the communication of Elder Adams was published in *Times and Seasons* more than a year before the

death of Joseph Smith, and hence the year and three months increase was not computed by him; nor the further fact that the communication bears no date, and hence we can not determine when it was written nor when it was published in the *Bee*. Further, he does not tell us that Elder Adams in his communication speaks of the work being established in Upper Canada in 1836, "and soon spread through that Province." "This glorious message has also spread into Germany, a part of France, and reached even Constantinople, Jerusalem, the East Indies, and the islands of the seas."

These statements were before Mr. Roberts when he quoted Elder Adams, and he knew that Elder Adams made no computation of the numbers in these countries. Yet he quotes Mr. Adams' figures in the United States and Great Britain as though that was all. Reduces these figures one half—ten thousand on the authority of the editor of the *Times and Seasons*, and the other twenty-five thousand on his own assertion, all to prove that Joseph Smith and Wilford Woodruff did not know!

Further comment is needless.

Mr. Roberts quotes quite an array of testimony to prove that an exploring expedition was authorized by Joseph Smith to explore the western country. Some of this testimony is of a very questionable character and none of it is of very vital importance. Whether they organized to explore or not has nothing to do with the issues before us. I think it quite possible that they discussed the propriety of going west, south, and elsewhere; but that the determination

was finally made to settle in Utah, does not appear clear. And even if it did, it does not justify the Church policy adopted in Utah, which is the real issue between us. Nor would a determination in council to make a location in Salt Lake Valley, or anywhere else, change the decree of God as set forth in the revelation locating Zion, and declaring that it should not be removed out of its place.

In this connection Mr. Roberts introduces the testimony of two men who claim to have volunteered to go with the company to explore the West. The first is Mr. S. W. Richards. He simply states that he was one of a company of twenty-five young men to be sent "westward to find a suitable place for the Saints to move to, where they could rest for a time from the constant harassings and persecutions to which they were then being subjected, and which was likely to increase if the mob did not have the life of the Prophet placed at their disposal." He does not say that they were asked to go to the Rocky Mountains, only the direction is indicated westward from Nauvoo, and that the place to be selected was to be a temporary abiding place where the Saints could "rest for a time." In closing his statement he remarks that "California and Oregon if deemed necessary, were to be the fields of our exploration; while it was thought Lower California would offer the greatest inducements for locating a city for the Saints." This latter statement seems to be thrown in incidentally. He does not say that the Church authorities when asking him to go westward indicated these places, nor where the suggestion came from to explore California and

Oregon. Taking this last statement, it is very indefinite, showing that they had no settled decision as to where they would go.

Mr. Joseph A. Kelting, the other witness, is as indefinite upon this point as Mr. Richards, or even more so. He says: "I also know that previous to the death of the Prophet Joseph Smith, there was a movement on foot, looking to the removal of the Church from Illinois to the West. Joseph Smith was the one who took lead in that matter, and called upon certain brethren to go on an exploring expedition to seek a suitable location for the Church; and I was among the number selected to go."

There is no mention in this statement of the Rocky Mountains or the Great Salt Lake; but simply west from Illinois. After all their efforts to prove that Joseph Smith originated the exodus to the Rocky Mountains, they fail to prove that any place was selected or that it was finally determined to go west at all. The most that they can prove is that it was under consideration and its feasibility discussed. But as we have before said, that is not the issue at all. The issue is upon the policies adopted by that people. We have no objection to their temporary residence in the Salt Lake Valley, or anywhere else. Our objection is to making it the Zion of the Lord, and to the doctrines taught and the policies inaugurated.

Another subject, however, is introduced in this statement of Mr. Kelting, and it is sought to prove by him that Joseph Smith the Seer was implicated in polygamy. In this as on other points Mr. Roberts is

not treating upon the questions involved. The issue between us is not whether Joseph Smith taught and practiced polygamy or not; the question is, Is polygamy right, or is it wrong? However, it is proper to state that the evidence connecting Joseph Smith with polygamy is very unsatisfactory so far as we have been able to examine it; and this statement of Mr. Kelting is no exception to the rule. He represents the Prophet as being too cowardly to openly avow his convictions, which is exactly contrary to the record of the Prophet Joseph Smith. He is represented as taking Kelting into a private room, locking the door, and then making inquiry if he had heard certain things. Then pledging him not to tell if he revealed to him the facts in the case; getting his promise not to betray him, and then confidentially telling him about this plurality of wives doctrine; a doctrine, according to the purported revelation on the subject, that was of such importance as to affect the salvation of men's souls in eternity. Notwithstanding all this, the Prophet of the Lord in the secrecies of his own chamber pledges a man not to tell this important thing, and puts him under obligations by getting him to be a party to the practice. There is no one present but Joseph Smith and Joseph A. Kelting; no possibility of proving or disproving his statement by other witnesses, so far as the original conversation is concerned. The only intimation of any one knowing anything about it is that he told it sometime a few years ago to Alexander H. Smith, son of the Prophet. Elder Alexander H. Smith being the only other witness in the case, we wrote him, sending him a copy of

Mr. Joseph A. Kelting's statement and asking him to answer for publication as to his remembrance of such a conversation. In answer to our inquiry we received the following:

DETROIT, Minnesota, July 11, 1903.

BRO. HEMAN SMITH:

Yours of July 2, containing affidavit of one Joseph A. Kelting, of Colton, California, reached me this forenoon on my return from Bottineau, North Dakota.

I remember the man's name, but have no remembrance of having called upon him while in California. If I did it was not at Colton, but San Bernardino.

The man has simply drawn upon his imagination, for no such conversation ever passed between us. It is of such a nature that I should have remembered it. I could not well forget it. You will note he affirms his statement relative to the body of his article, and incidentally says he told me of it. You may publish my answer if you wish.

It is fabrication from beginning to end. The man evidently is taking refuge under that infamous clause in that supposed revelation on celestial marriage, which says, under certain conditions a man may commit all manner of sins save the shedding of innocent blood, etc. If that people are not taking refuge under a covering of lies, this world never saw a people who did.

Mr. Anson's statement is again published; but we quoted that in our reply to Mr. Roberts and made all the comments necessary. Then comes the purported statement of Gideon Carter without the signature of Mr. Carter, but stating that it was subscribed and sworn to the twenty-seventh day of February, 1874, before J. C. Christy, a notary public in and for San Bernardino County, state of California. Why Mr. Carter's signature is not secured seems strange. I was personally acquainted with Mr. Gideon Carter, and believed him to be an honest and truthful man.

can hardly credit the report that he ever said what he is reported to have said in this statement; for he represents that at the time of the death of Joseph Smith the Prophet he was living in the family of Orange Lysander Wight, the son of Lyman Wight. Though he does not say that they resided in Nauvoo, that inference is to be drawn, for he is relating events that transpired in Nauvoo, and he says that the killing of the Prophet is an event that he distinctly remembers.

Now, if Mr. Gideon Carter lived in the family of Orange Lysander Wight, in the spring and summer of 1844, he was not at Nauvoo but at Black River Falls, Wisconsin. A boy thirteen years of age, living in Wisconsin, with means of communication so limited as they then were, could have known but very little of events transpiring at Nauvoo at that period of time.

Lyman Wight in his journal states:

> I started about the middle of April, 1844, to Nauvoo with my wife and my three youngest children. My three oldest children having married on the sixth day of February last, I left them to tarry with the remainder of the company until the first of July next, having already sold the mills, but reserved them until that time.

Orange Wight was the oldest son of Lyman Wight, and is one of the three spoken of. The mills spoken of were at Black River Falls, Wisconsin, which place Lyman Wight was leaving in the middle of April to go to Nauvoo. According to this statement Mr. Gideon Carter is wrong; also when he says that Orange Wight married his sister Matilda Carter about

a year before the killing of Joseph Smith, for that event occurred on February 6, 1844, not quite five months before the death of Joseph Smith. He had been living in Wisconsin from sometime in 1843 until the middle of April, and was living there in April, 1844, to continue in possession of the mills until the first of the following July. His oldest sister, Mrs. Anna C. Smith, one of the three spoken of, who was married at the same time he was, now residing at Lamoni, Iowa, says she does not remember distinctly the date of their arrival in Nauvoo; but does remember distinctly that it was after the death of the Prophet, and that she came down the river on a raft in company with her brother Orange.

So Mr. Carter, if he ever made the statement, may be right in saying that he lived with Orange Lysander Wight; but if so, he is a very poor witness of what transpired at Nauvoo, being but a boy of thirteen years and not present. The rest of his testimony is very unimportant. He relates that Lyman Wight made certain claims in Texas in regard to the doctrine of polygamy. This is but second-hand testimony. Mr. Carter knows nothing about it. I have talked with Carter in regard to it; and while I found him quite willing to throw the responsibility of the conduct of those with whom he was nearly related upon Joseph Smith, he personally knew nothing in regard to Joseph Smith's connection with the practice of polygamy.

I presume that the date of this statement of Mr. Carter is a typographical error, and that it should be 1894 instead of 1874, as Mr. Roberts was in that

country in 1894, and the date of the statement of Joseph A. Kelting is March 1, 1894. The date of Carter's probably should be February 27, 1894. At that time Mr. Roberts was contemplating a discussion with some elders of the Reorganization in San Bernardino, and was doubtless collecting these statements for that purpose. But if so, why did he not give his opponents an opportunity to be present when these examinations were made and to cross-examine the witnesses. Right in the neighborhood where his opponents were living, and where it was supposed the discussion would take place, he privately interviewed parties, procured a signed statement from one, and now publishes another unsigned and gives no opportunity for the other side to be represented. Such testimony as this is of but very little value; and we have already given it all the consideration that it merits, if not more.

Mr. Roberts publishes a statement purporting to be a statement of John Taylor and Orson Hyde, in a communication to the Saints in Great Britain, in which they give notice of the removal of the Church from Nauvoo, and further say "years before the temple was completed, and long before the martyrdom of our Prophet and Patriarch. Many living witnesses can testify that we proposed moving to California, leaving the land of our oppression, preaching the gospel to the Lamanites, building up other temples to the living God, and establishing ourselves in the far distant West."

This is immaterial. Suppose there was a proposi-

tion of that kind; it does not affect the main question at issue, as we have before shown.

On page 127 Mr. Roberts makes another of his historical mistakes. He says that "the Church while in the Eastern States never numbered more than three or at the most four stakes of Zion."

Mr. Roberts will hardly dispute that there was a stake at Kirtland, Ohio; one at Adam-ondi-Ahman, in Missouri; one at Commerce, or Nauvoo; one called the Zarahemla Stake, across the river from Nauvoo. *Millennial Star*, volume 18, page 55, contains a notice of the First Presidency deciding to organize a stake at Crooked Creek, Illinois. On December 4 and 5, 1841, a conference was held at Ramus, Illinois, at which time it was decided that the organization of Ramus Stake should be discontinued. At the October conference of 1840 a committee was appointed to organize stakes, consisting of Hyrum Smith, Lyman Wight, and Almon Babbitt; and during the same month they organized stakes at Lima, Quincy, Mount Hope, and Freedom, and on the first of November they organized a stake called Geneva Stake, in Morgan County, Illinois.

Here are at least eleven stakes organized in the East. Mr. Roberts may mean, however, that there were never more than three or four at the same time. But this is not true, for here is an account of at least five organized within one month after the October conference of 1840.

In my reply to Mr. Roberts I refused to take the statement in that "carefully revised" history of Joseph Smith as evidence that there could be more

than seven quorums of seventy legally in existence at the same time. Mr. Roberts, on page 129 of his revised edition, cites as confirmation of his former statement the following from a copy of the manuscript of Church History written by John Whitmer:

> About the same time . . . there were seventy high priests chosen, who were called elders, to be under the direction of the Twelve and assist them according to their needs, and if the seventy were not enough, call seventy more until seventy times seventy.

This history, written by John Whitmer, of which Mr. Roberts says the Church in Utah has a copy, is now in our hands. The quotation by Mr. Roberts is nearly correct; but Mr. Roberts would hardly be willing to take the statement of John Whitmer as being correct in every particular, for he will not admit, I believe, that these seventy were high priests. There are many things in this history of John Whitmer which Mr. Roberts would not admit as authoritative. If Mr. Roberts has had an opportunity of perusing the copy of this history, he certainly knows that Mr. Whitmer was not an accurate historian. Nor has the Church in Utah confined itself to the limit set forth in this quotation from John Whitmer. They have more than doubled the number of "seventy times seventy."

On page 132 Mr. Roberts quotes a statement made in our reply to the effect that ordinations to the priesthood for the dead, endowments for the dead, sealings (husbands and wives) for the dead, sealings (children to parents) for the dead, were not contemplated in the law of God; and then asks the author

of the "Reply" if he will "undertake to argue that confirmation is not as necessary to salvation of the dead as baptism; or that baptism is complete without the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as well as the baptism of water."

Certainly not. Why does Mr. Roberts lug in the ordinance of confirmation and the receiving of the Holy Ghost here, when it is not mentioned by us? We mentioned that the law did not contemplate ordinations for the dead, endowments for the dead, the sealing of husbands and wives, and the sealing of children to parents. We do not deny the ordinance of confirmation in its proper place nor the reception of the Holy Spirit.

But he again quotes (page 133) that revised history of Joseph Smith, volume twelve of *Millennial Star*, page 664. This reference is probably a typographical error, as we have not been able to find the quotation by the reference. But this particular quotation purports to be a sermon delivered by Joseph Smith, January 20, 1844, reported by Elder Woodruff. He is there made to say regarding the dead:

> But how are we to become saviors on Mount Zion? By building their temples, erecting their baptismal fonts, and going forth and receiving all the ordinances, baptisms, confirmations, washings, anointings, ordinations, and sealing powers upon their heads, in behalf of all their progenitors who are dead, and redeem them that they may come forth in the first resurrection and be exalted to thrones of glory with them; and herein is the chain that binds the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers, which fulfills the mission of Elijah.

The only point in which this purported sermon conflicts with our statement is on the ordinations. Nothing even in that about sealing husbands and wives, parents and children! We are still of the opinion that the people in Utah are doing work in their temples not authorized by the law of God, at least they have not been able to produce any law covering their practices.

Mr. Roberts in his first edition stated that "some of our 'friends' of high standing in the 'Reorganization' joining in the hue and cry against the Saints of God, and aiding in the work of misrepresentation."

In replying to this I challenged the proof that the Reorganization had aided in the work of misrepresentation. Replying to this challenge Mr. Roberts says:

Well, here is the proof: On February 22, 1882, in the course of a speech against the Church in Utah, Joseph Smith, the President of the Reorganized Church said:

"There were many men in Utah who were single because they said they had no assurance they could find for wives women who were not contaminated. They might go to the farm houses to choose wives, but could not feel certain that some of the bishops had not been there and robbed the daughters of their virtue."—The Chicago *Daily Inter-Ocean*, February 23, 1882.

The Chicago *Times*' version of this part of the same speech, under the caption "A Lusty War Cry" (issue of February 23, 1882), is as follows:

"There are hundreds and thousands of Mormons in Utah who will not marry wives because they do not know where to get wives that have not been contaminated. They do not know what houses have escaped the invasion of lecherous bishops who have robbed hundreds of women of their purity. The men can not afford to take the risks that marriage means."

Many vile and vicious things have been said of the Saints in

Utah, but it was reserved for Joseph Smith, the President of the Reorganized Church, to say at once the most untruthful, the lowest, the most contemptible, cowardly, and vicious thing that ever was said of a much-maligned and misrepresented people. And what makes it so utterly inexcusable is the fact that the speaker knew better; for he had been in Utah, and had been among the people sufficiently to know that no such conditions as he describes in that speech existed. It was malicious, willful misrepresentation. He bore false witness against his neighbors. At the time of the speech I noted down the misrepresantations, not from the Chicago papers, but from other papers, for the false statement was widely copied, and I think made a dispatch to the press of the country. Recently I sent to the Chicago papers and had the above quotations verified.

It is only necessary to say in this connection that President Joseph Smith denied these statements, and published his denial immediately after. In the *Saints' Herald* for June 1, 1882, there is not only a denial but a statement of what he did say as follows:

Some of the statements made by the Editor in the speech, complained of by the *News*, are not given in the *Tribune's* report as they were uttered. This is the case with the one referring to the "contamination of women by Mormon bishops." The statement as made by the Editor was this; that whi e in Salt Lake City, in 1876, he became acquainted with an unmarried man, then thirty-nine years old, whose youth and early manhood had been spent in Utah. The Editor asked him the question why he had not married, and he gave in reply substantially, that he did not know where to go in the Territory, to get a wife; that it was not easy to find young marriageable women who were not already married into polygamous families, or were bespoken for some bishop. This man further stated that he was *not alone* in being unmarried for the same cause, the contamination of polygamy. We believe the statement made by him was true; but the *Tribune's* report gives the Editor as the author of the saying.

Notwithstanding this denial the people of Utah continued to reiterate the charge; and July 2, 1885, President Smith while in Salt Lake City wrote a communication on the subject to the *Deseret News* and handed it to the editor in person. I am informed that it did not appear. It was, however, published in the *Saints' Advocate* for July, 1885. The letter is as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, July 2, 1885.

Editor Deseret News: Please do me the justice of the following correction:

The statement complained of by you in your to-day's issue, as given in the Chicago *Tribune's* report of my Chicago speech, February 22, 1882, was not made by me in the form stated. The statement made by me was, 'That while in Salt Lake City, in 1876, I became acquainted with an unmarried man, then thirty-nine years old, whose youth and early manhood had been spent in Utah. I asked him the question why he had not married, and he gave in reply, substantially, that he did not know where to go in the Territory to get a wife; that it was not easy to find young marriageable women, who were not already married into polygamous families, or were bespoken for some bishop. This man further stated that he was not alone in being unmarried for the same cause, the contamination of polygamy"

Neither the *Times* nor *Herald* gave the sentence in the obnoxious form used by the *Tribune*. I had twice before been misrepresented by the same paper, and tried to have them set me right, and failed; and so did not try in this instance; but in the issue of our own paper, the *Saints' Herald* for June 1, 1882, as soon after the presentation of the matter in your issue for May 13, 1882, as it was possible, I published this correction, of which a copy of the paper containing it was sent you, with the denial of having made the statement; using the following language concerning it: "The statement as given in the *Tribune* report, and which the *News* denounces as an 'atrocious lie,' was not made as stated. The *Times* and *Herald* each published a

report, and neither of them got the remark in the form given by the *Tribune*. As given it is a harsh remark, of which we do not object to the *News* finding fault."

The virtue and purity of the women of Utah, aside from plural marriage, were not questioned by me and never have been.

I hand you herewith a copy of the *Saints' Herald* for June 1, 1882, that you may see that I made the correction of the improper statement as soon as I could after my attention was called to it. Had I made the remark I should justly deserve censure; but not having made it, you should in honor to yourself and justice to me permit this to go before your readers.

Yours respectfully,

JOSEPH SMITH.

Mr. Roberts may claim that the denial of President Smith was only on the *Tribune* report, whereas he is quoted from the *Daily Inter-Ocean* and the Chicago *Times*. But though the reports in these papers may differ, Mr. Roberts certainly is not justified, in the light of these explanations, in quoting the language as President Smith's when he clearly states that it was the language of another, and also gives the language which he did use, which differs materially from that published in the *Times*, *Inter-Ocean*, *Herald*, and *Tribune*.

In Mr. Roberts' late edition of his book he adds an article entitled, "A Sufficient Answer to Josephites," which purports to have been published in the *Improvement Era* for February, 1898, and is now copied into this treatise.

In the first place he essays to state the position of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and states for them that they hold that Joseph Smith, the President of their organization, of right

should have succeeded to the Presidency for two reasons: "First, because, as they allege, it is his birthright; and second, by virtue of an ordination to that position which they affirm he received from his father before the latter's martyrdom."

This is not only a misstatement of the case but a partial statement also. The "Josephites" do claim that all other things being equal he had prior right by birthright; but they do not claim that he was ordained to that position by his father (only in the sense that an appointment can be called an ordination), but simply that he was blessed and designated as the successor. It was an appointment, not an ordination to the priesthood.

He should have said that the claim is made not only upon these two reasons, but, third, that he was called of God to that position; fourth, that he was accepted by the Church to serve in that capacity, and, fifth, that he was properly ordained by those authorized.

He again misstates our position when he says that the Reorganization claims "that in leading the people to Utah, the Twelve led them astray." It is not our claim, and Mr. Roberts ought to know it, that they led the people astray in leading them to Utah, but that they led them astray in many things besides leading them to Utah.

The "Sufficient Answer to Josephites," as Mr. Roberts terms it, consists in this: That in May, 1843, Joseph Smith had an interview with Stephen A. Douglas, and during that interview he said:

Judge, you will aspire to the presidency of the United States; and if you ever turn your hand against me or the Latter Day

Saints, you will feel the weight of the hand of the Almighty upon you; and you will live to see and know that I have testified the truth to you; for the conversation of this day will stick to you through life.

He claims that this prophecy was fulfilled, and that the hand of the Almighty rested upon Stephen A. Douglas because Mr. Douglas made a speech on the twelfth day of June, 1857, in Springfield, Illinois, in the course of which he said, referring to the Mormons:

Should such a state of things actually exist as we are led to infer from the reports—and such information comes in an official shape—the knife must be applied to this pestiferous, disgusting cancer which is gnawing into the very vitals of the body politic. It must be cut out by the roots, and seared over by the red-hot iron of stern and unflinching law. . . . Should all efforts fail to bring them to a sense of their duty, there is but one remedy left. Repeal the organic law of the Territory, on the ground that they are alien enemies and outlaws, unfit to be citizens of a territory, much less ever to become citizens of one of the free and independent States of this confederacy.

This was said regarding the people in Utah; but it will be noticed that Mr. Douglas based this strong statement on the contingency that "such a state of things actually exists as we are led to infer from the reports." Perhaps Mr. Douglas was right; and if a state of things such as was reported existed there, the measures advocated by Mr. Douglas would have been proper. We have not the reports and can not judge. But why hold, as Mr. Roberts concludes, that the judgments of God followed Stephen A. Douglas any more than any other defeated candidate for the presidency? Other men have been defeated. Other men died after their defeat; and but few if

any died more honored than Stephen A. Douglas by that portion of the citizenship which supported him.

But to show Mr. Roberts' ignorance of the facts of history we have but to quote one paragraph of his comments found on page 146 of his revised work:

Stephen A. Douglas did aspire to the presidency of the United States, and was nominated for that office by the Democratic Convention, held in Charleston, on the 23d of June, 1860. When in the convention he was declared the regular nominee of the Democratic party, "The whole body rose to its feet, hats were waved in the air and many tossed aloft; shouts, screams, and yells, and every boisterous mode of expressing approbation and unanimity, were resorted to."

When Mr. Douglas aspired to the presidency, no man in the history of American politics had more reason to hope for success. The political party of which he was the recognized leader, in the preceding presidential election had polled 174 electoral votes, as against 122 cast by the other two parties which opposed it; and a popular vote of 1,838,169, as against 1,215,798 votes for the two parties opposing.

It would be hard to form a passage as short as this with more mistakes in it. Stephen A. Douglas was not nominated at Charleston. The Charleston convention was not held in June but in April, at which time there was a division in the convention; and the part of the convention that favored Douglas met at Baltimore, Maryland, June 18, and there Douglas was nominated. He was not declared the regular nominee of the Democratic party in the convention that met at Charleston; simply the nominee of that convention that met at Baltimore. The Democratic party did not poll a majority of the popular vote in 1856 as asserted by Mr. Roberts. Mr. Buchanan polled 1,838,169 just as Mr. Roberts gives it, but his

two opponents' combined vote was greater than his. Fremont received 1,341,264, and Fillmore 874,534; making their combined vote 2,215,798. A mistake of just one million, a characteristic mistake *for Roberts* after all! (See History of Ready Reference by Larned, vol. 5; also Greeley's American Conflict, vol. 1.) It is not true that no man in politics had more reason than Douglas to hope for success. Had he represented the Democratic party as a whole, he might have had great reasons to hope for success; but he represented but a faction, and was nominated by a faction.

Mr. Roberts asserts that he "died at his home in Chicago, a disappointed, not to say heart-broken man."

There is no reason to say that he was a heart-broken man. Disappointed, of course, as many other men have been, but Stephen A. Douglas had the manly courage after his defeat, when the Union was about to be rent asunder, to rally to the support of Mr. Lincoln, his successful competitor. He advocated that it was the duty of the defeated party to sustain Mr. Lincoln's administration and the Union.

Mr. Roberts concludes after making these misstatements that this is a sufficient answer to the Josephites because it was not the Josephites whom Douglas spoke against but the people in Utah; and that he died under the judgment of God because he did so speak.

In the first place he did not speak against the people in Utah only on the supposition that reports con-

cerning them were true. In the second place there is no evidence that the judgment of God specially followed him. I presume Mr. Roberts would agree that if reports concerning the people in Utah were true some heroic measures would be necessary.

In Appendix 1, page 153, Mr. Roberts gives some instances of history which he claims would justify Joseph Smith in receiving a revelation on polygamy and keeping it secret, and that the charge of cowardice if he did so would not obtain. He speaks of Jesus the Christ saying unto his disciples that they should tell no man the vision, and quotes from that carefully revised history of Joseph Smith to show that on different occasions he counseled the elders not to teach certain doctrines until the work was more fully established. He also quotes from the revelation of March 7, 1831, as follows:

> And now I say unto you, Keep these things from going abroad unto the world, until it is expedient in me, that ye may accomplish this work in the eyes of the people and in the eyes of your enemies, that they may not know your works until ye have accomplished the thing which I have commanded you.—Doctrine and Covenants 45: 15. (Utah edition, paragraph 72.)

In the instruction of Christ to his disciples there was no principle of practice involved regarding which they were to keep silent. To make the revelation of 1831 apply Mr. Roberts would have to maintain that the terms *these things* and *this work* mean identically the same thing—a construction that the context will not justify.

The Lord has just been explaining some of his teaching to the early disciples, and says:

It shall not be given unto you to know any further concerning this chapter, until the New Testament be translated, and in it all these things shall be made known; wherefore I give unto you that you may now translate it, that ye may be prepared for the things to come," etc.—Paragraph 11.

A very good reason for keeping *these things* was that they were not fully revealed. This was given in March, 1831, and was of course to be understood in the light of what was given on the same point the month before as follows:

Thou shalt ask, and my scriptures shall be given as I have appointed, and they shall be preserved in safety; and it is expedient that thou shouldst hold thy peace concerning them, and not teach them until ye have received them in full. And I give unto you a commandment, that then ye shall teach them unto all men; for they shall be taught unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people."—Doctrine and Covenants 42: 15. (Utah edition, paragraphs 56–58.)

In the passage which Mr. Roberts quotes the phrase *these things* refers to the things which the Lord was partially explaining but which were not to be fully revealed until the New Testament was translated, and hence were not at that time to go unto the world. But *this work* referred to as "the thing which I have commanded you" refers to the work in hand, namely, the translation of the Scriptures. They understood by the express terms of the former commandment that they were to teach to all men the things prescribed as soon as they were revealed in full.

In the case of the polygamous revelation, so called, it was kept secret after it was revealed and in full force. Exactly the opposite procedure from the one referred to in the revelation of 1831.

There is nothing in what Mr. Roberts has quoted to justify the keeping of anything secret which affects the souls of men when the time for the accomplishment of the work arrives.

In Appendix 2, page 155, he seeks to justify the Church authorities in declining to discuss the issues between them and the Reorganization, and again quotes that carefully revised history by President Brigham Young, to show that Joseph Smith told the elders not to contend with others on account of their faith or systems of religion, but to pursue a steady course. An open, fair discussion of differences, and a contention with others on account of their faith or systems of religion, are quite different things. This did not forbid discussion held in the proper spirit of discussion. It was not so understood at the time, if indeed Joseph Smith ever said it; for the elders at that time did meet all who cared to differ from them in discussion. Few if any opportunities of the kind were ever declined. This shows that it was not their understanding that debates were forbidden.

But Mr. Roberts says:

> Though there may be times and circumstances when public debate would be proper—and at such times and places the elders of the Church will not be found wanting in the courage necessary to defend the truth.

It is peculiar, however, that the times and circumstances are always propitious when these Utah representatives meet the sectarian world; but entirely unpropitious when it becomes necessary to discuss with the representatives of the Reorganization.

Mr. Roberts closes with the testimony of President

Wilford Woodruff. I have already noticed that in my former treatise, and showed that he differed from the record in important particulars; and Mr. Roberts has not undertaken a defense. I therefore leave the matter for the consideration of the reader without further comment on this point.

If in anything we are surprised at Mr. Roberts' attempt to reply to our criticism, it is that the weakness of his position becomes more apparent, and we are more than ever convinced of the soundness of the position of the Reorganization.

Mr. Roberts in the course of his remarks throws out insinuations that we have abandoned certain positions because we did not defend all the arguments made by representatives of the Reorganization. Personally we have abandoned no position taken in the former book. It can hardly be expected of us, nor would Roberts be willing to place himself in that attitude, to defend all the arguments made by parties on his side of the question. It is not always, however, because we are not willing to defend that we have kept silent. Sometimes defense was not needed. Arguments may be fallacious; men may in their zeal strain texts to apply them where we do not see the application; but after all and the most that can be said, the position occupied by the Reorganization is invulnerable; and should the policy of the Reorganization continue to be in harmony with the foundations laid and the positions occupied by its early defenders it can not fail of success.

I submit this brief review, praying that the blessing of God may attend it; that light and liberty

may come to those who read, together with the courage of conviction, that they may henceforth stand for the right and the truth.

BANCROFT
LIBRARY

INDEX.

Account of meeting, 7.
Adam-God, theory of, taught, 123, 124, 145.
Adams, G. J., connected with Wm. Smith, 18; elation of, 47; on succession, 47, 48.
Additional correspondence, 149.
Amboy Conference, complaint filed against, 121.
Answers insisted upon, 62.
Apostasy to take place, 90.
Apostleship, senior of, to preside, 28.
Apostolic authority, of Reorganization, 62; renewal of, 141.
Approval of church necessary, 31.
Arizona, colonies formed in, 93.
Authority, prepared for defense of, 62; command of God sufficient, 143.

Baldwin Caleb, not on record, 40.
Baptism, for the dead, 95; legal and sufficient, 118.
Beeman, Alva, ordination of, 155, 156.
Bennett, J. C., conspiracy of, 8.
Benson, E. T., dispatched to meet companies, 116; present at reorganization, 119; received into Twelve, 121.
Biography of Anson Call, 88.
Bishop, law of lineage appertaining to, 50.
Blessing of Joseph Smith, 41, 43–48, 132.
Blood atonement taught by Young and Grant, 126–128, 145.
Bond, Ira, ordination of, 156.
Briggs, J. W., priesthood of, 28; revelation to, 134; instruction to, 134, 137.
Butterfield, Josiah, cut off the church, 122.

Calhoun, J. C., letter to, 55, 56.
Call, Anson, biography of, 88.
Cannon, Abram, position of, 53; ordination of, 157.
Cannon, G. Q., testimony of 9; sermon of, 129.
Carlin, Gov., conspiracy of, 8.
Carter, J. H., testimony of, 48.
Challenge, acceptance of, 57.
Christ, concerning birth of, 124.
Church, where is it—who represents it, 5; satisfied with Rigdon, 8; approval of necessary, 31; disorganization of, 68; rejection of, 68, 69; held together, 87; numerical strength of, 59, 87; to be driven West, 88, 91; remove to Rocky Mountains, 88–91.
Clark, J. B., letter of, 153.
Clawson, H. B., statement of, 129.
Code of good morals, Joseph Smith pledged to, 32, 33; Reorganization adheres to, 138.
Colorado, colonies formed in, 93.
Committees to select Twelve, 141, 142.
Conference of October, 1843, 8; at Amboy, 121.
Conspiracy of Carlin, et al., 8.
Correspondence, of Carlin, et al., 8; between Smith and Richards, 59–61.
Counterfeit, Reorganized Church a, 84.
Cowdery, Oliver, apostolic authority of, 63; to select Twelve —ordains them, 141.
Cowdery, William, ordination of, 155, 156.
Credit attaches to Prophet, 90.
Criminal record, glory of, 99.

Dealings of God, history of, 10.
Debts, Young's teaching concerning, 124, 125.
Derry, Charles, testimony of, 48.

Deseret News, evasive answers of, 61, 62; statement of, 129; letters of, 150, 151; should retract, 159.

Edict not enforced without consent, 31.
Eldredge, H. S., ordination of, 157.
Endowments for the dead, 95.
Expelled without trial, 122.

Family chosen of God rejected, 131.
First Presidency, what need have they for, 83.
Fjelsted, Daniel, ordination of, 157.

Gates, Jacob, ordination of, 157.
Gaulter, H. E., testimony of, 48.
Gaulter, Louis, testimony of, 48.
Gospel Herald attacks Lyman Wight, 37-39.
Grant, J. M., on blood atonement, 127; ordination of, 157.
Grant, H. J., position of, 53.
Gurley, Z. H., Sen., revelation to, 34; authority of, 63.

Harris, Martin, added to committee—ordains, 141.
Hewett, Richard, letter of, to J. J. Strang, 24, 25.
High Council, changes made in, 122; Marks President of, 142.
History, added to — misrepresented, 8; of God's dealings, 10.
Holy Scriptures, preservation of, 139; property of Reorganization, 140.
Hyde, Orson, suspended from office—restored, 16; challenged by Strang—reply of, 26, 27; quotes rule to test revelations, 31; statement of, 81, 82; in the East, 114; position of on rebaptism, 117, 118.

Idaho, colonies formed in, 93.
Improvement Associations, establishing of, 93.
Independence Temple, building of, 97.
Inspired Translation, on order of priesthood, 55.
Isaiah, prophecy of, 92.
Issue, rests upon what done and how done, 79; the real, 85; clearly defined, 155.

Jaques, John, signs for Richards, 61.
Jensen, Andrew, statement of, 97; Historical Record of, 156.
"Josephite" contention sustained, 159.

Kay, James, letter of, 18.
Key doctrine, legitimate results of, 145.
Keys, belong to Presidency, 44, 134; not taken by Joseph, 76; definition of, 77, 78; interpretation of, 78; bestowed on the Twelve, 80-83.
Kimball, H. C., in the East, 114; rebaptized—reordained, 116; attends council — chosen counselor, 119.
Kirtland Temple, building of, 97; title in Reorganization, 98.

Leading spirits, Penrose's assertion concerning, 101.
Letter, Kay to Millennial Star, 18; Miller and Hewett to Strang, 24, 25; Strang to Taylor and Hyde, 26; Hyde and Taylor to Strang, 27; Wight to Northern Islander, 36; Smith to Richards, 59-61; Richards to Smith, 59; Smith to Stubbart, 104-111; Luff to Parker, 111-113; Long to Penrose, 149-151; Deseret News to Long, 150, 151; Penrose to Long, 152; Clark to Richards, 153; Richards to Clark, 154.
Liars, Young's claims concerning, 125.
Lineal priesthood, 17-20, 38, 44, 45, 50-56; practiced by Utah Church, 53.
Logan, temple of, 95, 96, 98.

Long, J. O., letters of, 149–151.
Luff, Joseph, letter of concerning interview, 111–113.
Lyman, Amasa, addresses meeting, 12; rebaptism and reordination of, 116; present at reorganization, 119; offered position, 121.
Lyman, F. M., position of, 53.

Manifesto issued by Woodruff, 130, 131.
Manti, temple of, 95, 96, 98.
Marks, William, attitude of, 14; authority of, 63; indorses Twelve, 83, 84; enemy to gain advantage over, 84; a blessing to many, 84; removed from position, 122; appeals to written word, 122; President of High Council—assists in ordination, 142.
McRae, Alexander, not on record —silence of, 40.
Meeting, account of, 7; of August 8, 1844, 9.
Miller, George, introduced by Roberts, 21; letter of, to Strang, 24; reason of, for disagreement, 25; testimony of, 48, 49; action of, explained, 49, 50; relegated to second place, 121; ordination of, 156.
Miller, U. G., inquiry of, 61.
Milliken, Arthur, testimony of, 48.
Mills, D. S., testimony of, 48.
Moore, A. B., testimony of, 48.
Morgan, John, ordination of, 157.
Moses, revelation to, 10.
Mountain, definition of, 92.

Nauvoo, building of, 88, 91.
Nauvoo House, Smith family to have place in, 42, 43, 45; resting place, 42; building of, 41, 88.
Nauvoo Temple, building of, 88, 97.
Notice, promise of, 115; not given, 120.

Officers, to be approved by church, 31; return of anticipated, 114.
Olney, Oliver, ordination of, 156.
Opponents, extravagance of, 157.
Oracles, given to the church, 76, 78–80; definition of, 77–79.
Ordination, necessity for, 58, 62; for the dead, 95; apostles and high priests officiate at, 143.
Page, J. E., at Pittsburg, 114; disapproved of, 121.

Parker, R. J., letter to, 111–113.
Patriarch, William Smith ordained, 16; law of lineage appertaining to, 50, 52; mentioned by Young, 86.
Pattern, organize according to original, 86.
Penitentiary, ex-convicts from, 99.
Penrose, C. W., echoes Roberts, 45; on completion of temple, 69–71; on release from obligations, 73; on temple building, 96; reply to, 101; assumes without proof, 101; on order and discipline, 103; connected with historical department, 149; letter of, 152; position of, 155; tangle of, 159.
People unprepared for events, 114.
Persecution, Roberts' claim concerning, 98, 99.
Phelps, Elder, addresses meeting, 12; moves to accept Twelve, 116.
Piercy, Frederick, trip of, 30.
Pledge of Joseph Smith, 31–33.
Plural marriage, first indorsement of, 128.
Polygamy, action of Reorganization concerning, 100; introduction of, 128; doomed, 130, 145; successor cannot accept, 147.
Pratt, Orson, in the East, 114; rebaptism and reordination of, 116; present at reorganization, 119.
Pratt, P. P., addresses meeting, 12; on disorganization, 74; on reorganization, 74; revelation to, 75, 79, 85, 91; statement of, 80, 82, 91; in New York—returns to Nauvoo, 114; in Salt Lake Valley, 120.
Prediction not fulfilled, 7.
President of high priesthood, ordination to, 143.
Priesthood, source of, 144, 145.

Presidency, keys of kingdom belong to, 44, 45; in Joseph's posterity, 44, 45.
Presidents, ordination of, 155-158.
Priesthood of apostles, 28.
Prophetic character of prediction, 7.

Quorums, to approve revelations, 31; set in order, 157.

Rebaptism, of Twelve, 116, 117; enjoined, 117, 118; necessity for, 117, 118.
Relief Societies, establishing of, 93.
Reordination, 116, 118, 119.
Reorganization still exists, 6; absorbs Wight's following, 23; history of, 28; stream of—resolution of, 34; not composed of Strangites and Smithites, 35; approved, 57, 58; apostolic authority of, 62, 63; necessity for, 74, 75, 79, 85.86; a counterfeit. 84; action of, 100; leading spirits of, 101, 102; opposed to polygamy, 129; position of, 133, 134; acknowledged of God, 132–140; redeeming waste places, 138; authority in, 140-146; position of, 155; president of, 160.
Residue, gathering of, 136-138.
Resolution of Strangites, 39.
Revelation, to Moses, 10; to be approved by quorums, 31; to Z. H. Gurley, 34; to F. G. Williams, 44; to Joseph Smith, 57; Joseph Smith to receive, 78; to P. P. Pratt, 75, 79; danger in, 146.
Richards, F. D., publishes Illustrated Route, 30; letters of, 59, 154; estimate of, 87; position of, 155; assertion of false, 158; acknowledgment of, 160.
Richards, S. W., arranges with Piercy, 30.
Richards, Willard, at Nauvoo, 114; rebaptism and reordination of, 116.
Rigdon, Sidney, failure of, 5; slandered — suspected—blamable — exonerated, 8; meeting called by, 12; refuses to have name presented, 12; acquiesces, 14; in Pennsylvania—returns to Nauvoo. 114; appoints meeting—claims not presented, 115; disposed of—expelled, 121.
Roberts, B. H., his introduction, 5; gives prominence to prediction, 5; assumes point at issue, 5; unenviable controversialist, 6; admits prediction is not fulfilled, 6; forms conclusion without evidence, 6; quotes doubtful authority, 7; blunders, 7; cites hearsay, 7; unkind—his incentive, 8; misrepresents, 8; tendencies of, 9; introduces meeting of August 8, 9; against the record, 12; introduces work of Wm. Smith—personal interview, 15; misstatement of, 16; errs on Wm. Smith, 17, 18; reckless assumption of, 21; errs on Lyman Wight, 22-24; strictures of on Bishop Miller, 24, 25; unmanly attack of, 27; sarcastic statement of, 29; sneers of, 30; unenviable position of, 39; pettifoggery of. 40; fatal concession of, 56, 57; affirmation of, 62, 64; seeks to make contrast, 63; against Woodruff and Staines, 67; on completion of temple, 69, 70; claim of, 79; confounds keys with oracles, 77; unfortunate, 85; distorts language, 86; specifications of, 86; on Governor Wells, 103.
Rocky Mountains, prediction concerning, 88-91; people led to, 93.
Rule established by Joseph Smith, 31.

Satan, transformation of. 11.
Salt Lake, temple of, 95-98.
Salt Lake Valley, strange events in, 116.
Science favors lineal priesthood, 52.
Sealings for the dead, 95.
Seventies, selection of, 94; provision for, 93, 94; presidents of ignored, 94; nine extra quorums —Brigham's nominees, 122; presidents of ordained, 156, 157.

Smith, A. H., on completion of temple, 70; discourse of, 86.
Smith, Don C., ordination of, 155, 156.
Smith, Emma, testimony of, 46, 47; Holy Scriptures in hands of, 139.
Smith family, commendation of, 30; their place, 53.
Smith, G. A., in Michigan, 114; rebaptism and reordination of, 116; present at reorganization, 119.
Smith, Heman C., letters of, 59–61.
Smith, Hyrum, successorship of, 50, 65.
Smith, J. F., position of, 53.
Smith, J. H., position of, 53.
Smith, John, presents the Twelve, 116.
Smith, John, position of, 53.
Smith, Joseph, (first President,) history of added to, 8; explanation of, 8; attends council of Twelve, 16; rule established by, 31; words of to be received, 33; blessing of, 41, 42, 43, 44; and family to have place in Nauvoo House, 42; posterity of, to be plants of renown, 42, 43; to hold presidency, 44, 45; on priesthood, 53–55; apostolic authority of, 63; his right to appoint successor, 63–65, 79, 160; on completion of temple, 72; authority to receive revelations, 78; language of, 80, 82, 83; prophecy concerning Rocky Mountains, 88–91; writes to his wife, 90, 91; warning to church, 72, 91; things written into history of, 94; not responsible for departure, 95; ordained President, 143, 157, 158.
Smith, Joseph, (second President,) received by Wight's followers, 23; enterprises of, 29; and family, reputation of, 30; his speech of acceptance — pledge of, 31; power by which dictated, 32; acquainted with associates, 32; blessings of, 39, 40, 45–48, 132; statement of, 40; calling of, 41; appointed by his father, 45–49; testimony of, 46; revelation to — autobiography of, 57; ordination of, 62; on completion of temple, 70; interviewed by Spencer, et al., 103–113; proceedings of, 132; his call to scattered saints, 138, 139; ordination of, 142, 146; teaching of, 146–148; Prophet and President, 148; ordained President, 158; requisites of, 160.
Smith, Lucy, Roberts' attempt to convict, 19; testimony of, 48.
Smith, Sylvester, ordination of, 156.
Smith, William, failure of, 5; his work introduced, 15; suspended from office—restored, 16; ordained Patriarch, 16; commendation of, 17; on lineal priesthood, 17, 18, 20, 38; action against, 18, 19; on disorganization, 18, 74; in the East, 114; disapproval of, 121.
Snider, John, removed from building committee, 122.
Snow, Lorenzo, ordination of, 59, 62; not ordained, 143.
Spencer, S. G., interview with, 103–113; statements of conflict, 104; seeks to find conflict, 113.
Spirit enables men to develop, 10.
Staines, W. C., testimony of, 10; against Roberts, 67.
Stakes of Zion, establishing of, 93.
Statement, not significant, 5; evidence of not complete, 6; of Brigham Young, 80, 82; of Orson Hyde, 81, 82; of Wilford Woodruff, 81–83; of P. P. Pratt, 80–82.
St. George, temple of, 95, 96, 98.
Stout, J. H., inquiry of, 61.
Strang, J. J., failure of, 5; work of—courage of, 26; challenges Taylor and Hyde, 26, 27; unmanly attack on, 27.
Stubbart, J. M., letter to, 104.
Successor, how appointed, 63, 64; to be appointed by Joseph, 63–65, 79; teaching of, 146, 147; conditions of appointment, 147.
Sunday schools, establishing of, 93.

Suspended without trial, 122.

Taylor, John, editor and proprietor, 17; private journal of, 19; challenged by Strang—reply of, 26, 27; ordination of, 59–62, 154, 158; in Nauvoo, 114; editor, 115; in Salt Lake Valley, 120; not ordained, 143.
Taylor, J. W., position of, 53.
Taylor, W. W., ordination of, 157.
Teasdale, George, on marriage question, 130.
Temple, completion of, 69–72; building of, 69; of Logan, 95, 96, 98; of Manti, 95, 96, 98; of St. George, 71, 95, 96, 98; of Salt Lake, 95–97; commandment concerning building, 96, 97; at Kirtland, 97, 98; at Independence, 97; at Nauvoo, 97; attempt to build without revelation, 97.
Testimony of G. Q. Cannon, 9; of W. C. Staines, 10; of W. Woodruff, 10; of Lyman Wight, 36, 37.
Transformation, Satan author of, 11; counterpart of, 11.
Tullidge quotes Woodruff, 116.
Twelve, dictation of, 9; sustaining the, 13, 115, 116; seven of, chosen, 28; senior of, to preside, 28; at Nauvoo, 29; next to First Presidency, 68; on completion of temple, 72; authority and mission of, 75; recognition of, 79; keys bestowed upon, 76, 79–83; indorsed by Marks, 83, 84; general epistle of, 85; build Nauvoo, etc., 88; failed to build, 88; turn towards West, 88; seventies increased by, 93, 94; in Nauvoo, 114; rebaptism and reordination of, 116; council of, 119; selection of, 141, 142; authority of, 141.

Unlawful cohabitation, action of Reorganization concerning, 100.
Utah authorities, abominable teaching of, 148.
Utah, colonies formed in, 93.

Wells, Governor, on Roberts, 103.
Whitehead, James, testimony of, 46–48.
Whitmer, David, to select Twelve —ordains them, 141.
Whitney, N. K., placed over Miller, 121.
Wight, Lyman, introduced by Roberts—true to Joseph Smith, 21; directs in pinery — visits Nauvoo—goes East—returns to Nauvoo and Wisconsin, 22; following of—death of, 23; posterity of, 23; Galveston News' mention of, 24; testimony of, 36, 37; on lineal priesthood, 38, 39; attacked by Gospel Herald, 37, 38; Roberts' attempted impeachment of, 39; on disorganization, 74; in the East, 114; not with the Twelve, 119, 120; disapproved of, 121; removed from building committee, 122.
Wilderness, church not to flee to, 74, 75, 79, 91.
Williams, F. G., revelation to, 44.
Wisconsin, Wight and Miller in, 22, 23.
Woodruff, A. O., position of, 53.
Woodruff, Wilford, testimony of, 10, 13; against the record, 13; ordination of, 59–62, 154, 158; against Roberts and record, 67; statement of, 81–83; report of, 87; testimony of, 102; in the East, 114; Tullidge quotes, 116; rebaptism and reordination of, 116; present at reorganization, 119; issues manifesto, 130, 131; not ordained, 143.
Wyoming, colonies formed in, 93.

Young, Brigham, Jr., position of, 53.
Young, Brigham, Sen., language of, 5; policy of, 9; assumes appearance of Smith, 9; fraudulent attitude of, 10; assumes control of meeting, 12; speaks —presents motion, 12; boastful spirit of, 33; ambition of himself and successors, 53; ordination of, 59–62, 154, 158; admission of, 62; on completion of temple, 71; statements of, 80; signs general epistle, 85; on re-

organizing church, 85; on temple building, 97, 98; movements of—in the east, 114; assumes control, 115; rebaptized, 116; counsels rebaptism, 118; chosen President, 119; votes for himself, 120; removes men from office, 121; repudiates written word, 122; on Joseph Smith and keys, 123; on Adam-God and birth of Christ, 124; on debts, 124, 125; liars, thieves, etc., 125; blood atonement, 126, 127; responsible for polygamy, 128; interview of, 129; prophesies concerning polygamy, 129, 130; proved a false prophet, 131; not ordained, 143.

Young, Joseph, ordination of, 156.

Young, S. B., ordination of, 157.

Zarahemla, reorganization at, 57, 132, 133.

Zion, redemption of, 135, 136.

Zion's Camp, work of, 137.